

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXX.

BALTIMORE, JANUARY, 1915.

No. 1.

THE DATES OF CORNEILLE'S EARLY PLAYS

In dating the plays that Corneille wrote before the *Cid* most modern scholars have accepted conclusions of the frères Parfaict,¹ Marty-Laveaux,² and a few other writers, without thoroughly testing them with recently discovered facts concerning Corneille's contemporaries and the stage for which they wrote. The following table gives the dates assigned to the first representations of his first eight plays by the frères Parfaict, Marty-Laveaux, and Lanson,³ as well as the date of each play's privilege and *achevé d'imprimer*.

	Frères Parfaict	Marty- Laveaux	Lanson *	Privilege	Achévé
<i>Mélite</i>	1629	1629	1629	Jan. 31, 1633	Feb. 12, 1633
<i>Clitandre</i>	1632	1632	1632 (?)	March 8, 1632	March 20, 1632
<i>La Veuve</i>	1633	1633	1632 (?)	March 9, 1634	March 13, 1634
<i>La Galerie du Palais</i> ...	1634	1633, 1634 *	1633	Jan. 21, 1637	Feb. 20, 1637
<i>La Suivante</i>	1634	1634	1633-4	Jan. 21, 1637	Sept. 9, 1637
<i>La Place royale</i>	1635	1634, 1635 *	1633	Jan. 21, 1637	Feb. 20, 1637
<i>Médée</i>	1635	1635	1635	Feb. 11, 1639	March 16, 1639
<i>L'illusion comique</i>	1636	1636	1636	Feb. 11, 1639	March 16, 1639

To estimate the correctness of these dates, let us turn first to the evidence given by Corneille himself. His statements as to the length of time he has been writing help us little, for

¹ *Histoire du théâtre français*, Paris, 1734-1748.

² *Œuvres de P. Corneille*, Paris, 1862-1868 (*Grands Écrivains* collection).

³ *Corneille*, second edition, Paris, 1905, pp. 11 and 48.

* Lanson's dates are substantially the same as those given in 1885 by U. Meier, *ZSNS.*, VII, 127-135, except that the latter makes 1631 the date of *Clitandre* and has the *Suivante* precede the *Place royale*. Faguet has returned to Marty-Laveaux's dates in his recent volume, *En lisant Corneille*, Paris, 1913, p. 8.

⁵ I, p. xxiv, he gives the first date; II, 1, 9, the second.

⁶ I, p. xxiv, he gives the first date and explains his mistake in giving the second, found II, 215, 219.

in 1660 he calls this period thirty years, in 1668 forty, in 1682 fifty.⁷ They indicate merely that he began to write about 1628-1632. But he does render us valuable assistance when he states that *Mélite* was his first play,⁸ that *Clitandre* was written after a visit to Paris which followed the first representations of *Mélite*,⁹ that by March 13, 1634, he had written six plays,¹⁰ and that the order of the composition of his plays is that of their position in the first edition of his collected plays.¹¹ From these facts it is evident that *Mélite* and *Clitandre* were acted before March 8, 1632, date of the latter's privilege, that the *Veuve*, *Galerie*, *Suivante*, *Place royale* were composed in this order before March 13, 1634, and that

Médée and the *Illusion comique* appeared before the first representation of the *Cid*, which took place in December, 1636, or January, 1637. These facts seem certain. Let us now consider the plays separately.

1. *Mélite*. Fontenelle's date, 1625, is entirely inconsistent with other dates in Corneille's career, as will appear from the following discussion. The frères Parfaict¹² substitute for it 1629 on the ground that Mairret de-

⁷ *Discours du poème dramatique*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 16.

⁸ *Examen de Mélite*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 137.

⁹ *Examen de Clitandre*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 270.

¹⁰ *Au Lecteur de la Veuve*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 378.

¹¹ *Au Lecteur, Œuvres de Corneille*, Rouen et Paris, 1644, petit in-12; Marty-Laveaux, I, 2.

¹² IV, 462.

clared¹³ in 1636 that Rotrou, Scudéry, Corneille, Du Ryer began to write in this order after himself. To their knowledge that Rotrou began writing in 1628, Marty-Laveaux¹⁴ adds the information that Scudéry produced his first play "en sortant du régiment des gardes," and that he was in the army as late as March, 1629. He then states that Du Ryer's first play was *Argénis et Poliarque*, whose privilege was obtained February 25, 1630, and concludes that *Mélite* was first represented between these last dates. Eugène Rigal¹⁵ supports this conclusion by citing Corneille's assertion¹⁶ that *Mélite* "établit une troupe de comédiens à Paris," and by arguing that this troop, afterwards that of the Marais, began to play in the fall of 1629.

But Mairet's statement cannot be accepted with confidence. The passage in which it occurs is one in which he is trying to prove himself very precocious and the first in date of the new generation of dramatists. He deliberately changes his own birth-date for this purpose and may have pretended that Du Ryer began writing after Rotrou, Corneille, and Scudéry because it was he who was his nearest rival for priority. It is probable that Du Ryer wrote *Argénis et Poliarque* no later than the first part of 1629 and it is still more probable that he had already written two other plays.¹⁷ Moreover, it is by no means certain that Scudéry's first production appeared before 1630.¹⁸ Consequently Mairet's evidence does not prove

that *Mélite* was written in 1629, but merely that Corneille began to write about the same time as these other dramatists, in the period 1628-1630.

Rigal's opinion is influenced by his acceptance of Marty-Laveaux's dating. Mondory's troop, which, according to Corneille, was established by *Mélite*, was accused in a lawsuit, brought against it on February 25, 1631, of having at that time given 135 performances outside of the Hôtel de Bourgogne.¹⁹ From this accusation Rigal argues that, as in Chappuzeau's time (1674) the troops gave three performances a week, while at the beginning of the seventeenth century they had given only one, they gave probably two a week towards 1631, and that therefore Mondory's troop must have begun playing by the fall of 1629 in order to have acted 135 times by February 25, 1631.

But we do not have to go so far as the time of Chappuzeau to find a troop giving as many as three performances a week. When Molière returned to Paris, his company acted regularly either three or four times a week, probably continuing a custom already established at the capital. Occasional omissions of regular performances were offset by extra representations at the houses of the nobility, so that this troop gave 135 performances in less than ten months, between April 28, 1659, and February 10, 1660. Three performances a week, therefore, are not too high an average for Mondory's troop while it was trying to establish itself at Paris. Certainly there is nothing improbable in this number, so that the evidence indicates only that the new troop began to play either in the fall of 1629 or in the early months of 1630.

Finally, the use of the word "établir" does not show that Corneille's play was the first that Mondory represented. His troop may have struggled for several months before being permanently established by the representation of *Mélite*. Rigal's testimony, therefore, while showing that the play was not represented before 1629, by no means prevents the acceptance

¹³ *Épître dédicatoire* to his *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne*.

¹⁴ I, 129.

¹⁵ *Esquisse d'une histoire des théâtres de Paris*, Paris, 1887, pp. 75, 76.

¹⁶ *Examen de Mélite*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 138.

¹⁷ *Arétaphile* and *Clitophon*, which were never published. I have shown from statements in their *avertissement*, from their structure, and from the facts of Du Ryer's life that these were his first plays, brought out as early as 1628. Cf. *Pierre Du Ryer Dramatist*, Washington, 1912, pp. 33, 34; *Pierre Du Ryer, écrivain dramatique* in *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1913, pp. 313, 314.

¹⁸ Note the altogether unsatisfactory reasons for dating it 1629 given by Battereau in his *Georges de Scudéry als Dramatiker*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 7, 8.

¹⁹ Eudore-Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière*, Paris, 1863, pp. 164, 165; Rigal, *op. cit.*, 69.

of 1630 as the probable date of its first representation.

Positive evidence in favor of the 1630 dating was discovered by Dannheisser²⁰ as early as 1890, but it has been very generally overlooked. In one of the polemical articles occasioned by the *Cid*'s success, the *Avertissement au Besançonnois Mairêt*, mention is made of "cette malheureuse *Silvanire* que le coup d'essai de M. Corneille terrassa dès sa première représentation."²¹ Evidently, then, *Mélite* followed *Silvanire*. What was the date of the latter play?

Dannheisser shows that, while Mairêt, in the *Épître* to his *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne*, deliberately changes his age to prove his precocity, the statements he makes with regard to the relative order of his own plays and the number of years that separated them from one another are probably correct. "Je composay ma *Chriseide* à seize ans. . . . *Silvie*, qui la suivit un an après. . . . Je fis la *Silvanire* à 21, *Le Duc d'Ossonne* à 23, *Virginie* à 24, *Sophonisbe* à 25, *Marc-Anthoine* et *Soliman* à 26." Therefore, since Marsan²² has established the date of *Sylvie* as 1626 or 1627, *Silvanire* was written in 1630 or 1631, preferably the former year as the privilege was obtained February 3, 1631.²³

Moreover, both Dannheisser and Marsan²⁴ call our attention to the following reference to *Silvanire* in the *Au lecteur* to the 1630 edition of *Sylvie*:²⁵ "Contente-toy de cet ouvrage cy, en attendant que je te donne une Tragi-Comédie purement Pastorale²⁶ de ma dernière

²⁰ *Zur Chronologie der Dramen Jean de Mairêt's*, *Romanische Forschungen*, V, 37-64, 1890.

²¹ Marty-Laveaux, III, 70.

²² *La Sylvie du sieur Mairêt*, Paris, 1905, pp. vii-xii.

²³ Had *Silvanire* been first produced in 1631, Mairêt would not have taunted Corneille with his unseemly haste in printing the *Cid* so soon after its first representation. Cf., below, my discussion of the date of *Clitandre*.

²⁴ *La Pastorale dramatique*, Paris, 1905, p. 375.

²⁵ *La Sylvie du sieur Mairêt*, 8. The *achevé d'imprimer* to this edition is not given.

²⁶ There can be no doubt of the fact that this means *Silvanire*, for Mairêt wrote no other pastoral than this after *Sylvie*.

et meilleure façon. Ce que je promets à ta curiosité, je le tiendray dans cette année 1630." If Mairêt is here referring to the approaching first representations of *Silvanire*, this is, of course, excellent proof that it appeared first in 1630, but even if he is referring only to its publication—and it seems strange that, if he is here promising its publication in 1630, he did not secure the privilege to print it till February 3, 1631—he still clearly implies that *Silvanire* is a new work, finished, perhaps, but not yet known to the public.

The preponderance of evidence points clearly, then, to the fact that *Silvanire* was first represented in 1630, and, indeed, this date has been generally accepted for it. But we continue to find 1629 set down as the year of *Mélite*'s first appearance. It is difficult to change a date so important as one that marks the opening of a great writer's career. Nevertheless, if we accept this date for *Silvanire*, and the evidence is most strongly in favor of it, we must acknowledge the logical implication that *Mélite*, which followed it, appeared no earlier than 1630.

That its first representation took place no later than the winter of 1630 is shown by Corneille's statement²⁷ that its "trois premières représentations ensemble n'eurent point tant d'affluence que la moindre de celles qui les suivirent *dans le même hiver*." This cannot mean the winter of 1630-1631, for that would place the first performance of *Mélite* too late to allow a reasonable time for the large number of representations that came between this first performance and February 25, 1631, date of the law-suit to which I have referred above. The reference must be to the winter of 1629-1630. Therefore, the conclusion that best fits all the facts in the case is that *Mélite* was first represented towards the month of February, 1630.

2. *Clitandre*. We know that this tragedy-comedy was written after its author had taken a trip to Paris to inquire about the success of *Mélite*,²⁸ and that the permission to print it

²⁷ *Épître à Monsieur de Liancour*, Marty-Laveaux, I, 135.

²⁸ Marty-Laveaux, I, 373.

was obtained March 8, 1632. Its earliest possible date would therefore be late in 1630. It is improbable that it was first acted later than 1631, for at this period, according to Chapelain in a letter of March 9, 1640, a play was rarely published less than six months after its first representation. This was largely due to the fact that a play could be acted by a troop other than that which first gave it only after its publication.²⁹ It was consequently to the interest of the actors to keep it out of print as long as possible. For this reason Mairet considered Corneille's quick publication of the *Cid* an injustice to the actors for whom he wrote.³⁰ Unless we have proof to the contrary, as in the case of the *Cid*, it seems safe to assume that a play's first representation occurred at least six months before the date of its privilege. I conclude, therefore, that *Clitandre* should be dated, not 1632, but 1631 or late in 1630.

3. *La Veuve*. The privilege was granted March 9, 1634. Expressions in the dedication and in a poem published with the play, "le bon accueil qu' autrefois cette Veuve a reçu," "un temps si long sans te montrer au jour," show, as Marty-Laveaux points out,³¹ that considerable time elapsed between the first representation of this comedy and its publication. Consequently the *Veuve*, represented after *Clitandre* and before the *Galerie du Palais*, must have appeared in 1631 or 1632.

4. *La Galerie du Palais*. According to the *Au lecteur* to *la Veuve*, printed March 13, 1634, Corneille had written six plays by this time.³² Hence *la Galerie du Palais*, *la Suivante*, and *la Place royale* were already finished, as well as *Mélite*, *Clitandre*, and *la*

Veuve. A Latin poem, composed between September, 1633, and August, 1634, confirms this evidence by references to the *Galerie* and the *Place royale*.³³ It is probable, therefore, that the first of the three was written and acted as early as 1632. To give it an earlier date would crowd too many of Corneille's plays into the years 1630-1631 and put the unusually long period of six years or more between the first acting and the printing of the *Galerie*. To date it 1633, on the other hand, would put too many plays into this year. Therefore, 1632 is the probable date of the play.

5. *La Suivante*. The fact that this comedy was printed a few months later than the *Place royale* does not mean that its first representation followed that of the other play, as can be seen by comparing the case of *Clitandre*, published before *Mélite*, but represented after it. On the other hand, we have Corneille's statement that the *Suivante* preceded the *Place royale* and there is a reference to the former play in the latter.³⁴ The *Suivante* should therefore be dated between the *Galerie du Palais* and the *Place royale*, in the first half of 1633 or, perhaps, late in 1632.

6. *La Place royale*. Claveret's *Place royale* was acted before the king at Forges between June 15 and July 3, 1633.³⁵ Its author charged Corneille with undertaking his play of the same name "dès que vous sîtes que j'y travaillois." Probably both plays were begun before the royal visit and Corneille's was brought out in the latter half of 1633. We have seen that it cannot possibly have appeared later than March 13, 1634.

7. *Médée*. By a reference to one of Balzac's letters³⁶ Marty-Laveaux³⁷ shows that *Médée*

²⁹ Frères Parfaict, IX, 105.

³⁰ *Lettre familière*, quoted by the frères Parfaict, V, 269. Cf. also Marty-Laveaux, III, 8.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, I, 373.

³² Marty-Laveaux, I, 378. Though this scholar realized what inference was to be drawn from this evidence, he stuck to the traditional date, 1635, for the first representation of the *Place royale* till he learned of the next piece of evidence I cite. The correct inference was drawn in 1885 by U. Meier, *op. cit.*, VII, 131.

³³ Bouquet, *Louis XIII et sa cour aux eaux de Forges*, in *Revue des Sociétés savantes des départements*, 2e série, I, 611-642 (1859); Marty-Laveaux, X, 68.

³⁴ Marty-Laveaux, II, 260.

³⁵ *Lettre du Sieur Claveret au Sieur Corneille*, 10; Bouquet, *loc. cit.*; Marty-Laveaux, X, 64; U. Meier, *op. cit.*, VII, 131, 132. The latter was, I believe, the first to date Corneille's play by its association with Claveret's.

³⁶ To Boisrobert, April 3, 1635.

³⁷ II, 330, 331.

must have been represented before April 3, 1635. It could not have been written long before, as it is referred to as "presque achevée" in the *Parnasse* of La Pinelière,³⁸ a book printed in 1635, written perhaps as early as the latter part of 1634. The date assigned to *Médée* should be, then, the end of 1634 or the beginning of 1635 and not simply the latter year, as we ordinarily find it.

8. *L'illusion comique*. As Mareschal tells us in the preface to his *Railleur* that this play preceded Corneille's *Illusion*, Marty-Laveaux³⁹ dates the latter comedy 1636, having learned from the frères Parfaict⁴⁰ that the *Railleur* was first given that year. But the frères Parfaict admit that they date the *Railleur* 1636 because it preceded the *Illusion*. As a matter of fact we do not know the date of the *Railleur*,⁴¹ so that, while we wait for its discovery, we must date the *Illusion* between *Médée* and the *Cid*, in 1635 or 1636.

I conclude from the foregoing that the most probable dates for the first representations of Corneille's early plays are:

1. *Mélite*, 1630, towards the month of February.
2. *Clitandre*, 1631, possibly late in 1630.
3. *La Veuve*, 1631 or 1632.
4. *La Galerie du Palais*, 1632.
5. *La Suivante*, 1633, possibly late in 1632.
6. *La Place royale*, 1633, possibly 1634 before March 13.
7. *Médée*, end of 1634, or 1635 before April 3.
8. *L'illusion comique*, 1635 or 1636.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

³⁸ Frères Parfaict, V, 166, and Marty-Laveaux, *loc. cit.*

³⁹ II, 424.

⁴⁰ V, 177.

⁴¹ If its author is correct in stating that it offers the first *miles gloriosus* of his generation, it must have been represented at least as early as 1633, date of the publication of Rayssiguier's *Bourgeoise*, which contains among its characters "Le Vaillant, Fanfaron."

CHAUCER'S BED'S HEAD

I. CHAUCER AND AMBROSE

In the *Physician's Tale* Chaucer, like Gower in his version of the theme of Apius and Virginia (*Confessio*, VII, 5130), is telling a story of Lechery and of its antitype, Chastity. In order to emphasize the baseness of "the cursed judge," the poet devotes many lines to the maidenly virtues of Virginia. She is indeed such a composite of moral traits that

In her living maydens mighten rede,
As in a book, every good word or dede,
That longeth to a mayden vertuous.

And as the reader surveys these attributes of noble maidenhood, he cannot resist the thought that Chaucer himself had "read them in a book." But in what book? Certainly not in the *Roman de la Rose*, which had furnished him large aid in his picture of the beauty of the girl and of Nature's delight in her workmanship; nor yet in Titus Livius nor in Gower. If Chaucer is not "having it all his own way," as Skeat suggests, if these seemingly typical traits of chastity are designedly conventional, they should naturally be sought—so reasoned this source-hunter—in early treatises upon Virginity. Could it be that Virginia—the name itself pointed the way to the poet—was patterned upon "the consecrated maid" of so many essays by the Fathers of the Church?

Keen in his quest, the seeker turned him first to Jerome, for had not the famous tract against Jovinian provided the Wife with much matter and supplied the Franklin with many examples of oppressed maidenhood courting death rather than shame? But though in the Jovinian treatise and in the admirable letters on Virginity, those to Eustochium (XXII, CVIII) and Furia (LIV) and Laeta (CVII) and Gaudentius (CXXVIII), one found in the many interesting parallels with Chaucer's sketch¹ comforting assurance that one was on the right track, still there was nowhere direct

¹ Compare with Chaucer's lines on the "mistresses" (C. 72 f.) Jerome's words in the Gauden-

indebtedness. Perhaps then in Augustine, whose definition of Envy is cited in this very context of Virginia's perfection? But a close examination of Augustine's *De Virginitate* and of his interesting discussion (*De Civitate Dei*, I, 19) of virgins who preferred suicide to violation yielded little save scattered resemblances. Why not then the writer whose "Three Books concerning Virgins"² is quoted with such approval by both Jerome and Augustine, Ambrose of Milan? And there the search came happily to an end.

Ambrose's description of Mary (Book II, chap. ii), "the pattern of life, showing as an example, the clear rules of virtue" might well have inspired Chaucer: "She was a virgin not only in body but also in mind, who stained the sincerity of her disposition by no guile, who was humble in heart, grave in speech, prudent in mind, sparing of words, studious in reading . . . intent on work, modest in discourse, . . . being wont only to go to such gatherings of men as mercy would not blush at, nor modesty pass by. There was nothing gloomy in her eyes, nothing forward in her words, nothing unseemly in her acts."³ Though the words, "She was a virgin not only in body but mind," are close indeed to Chaucer's "As wel in goost as body chast was she" and the likeness of traits is very striking, still these resemblances may not in themselves

tius letter: "Give her for guardian and companion a mistress and governess, one not given to much wine or in the apostle's words, idle and a tattler, but sober, grave, industrious in spinning and one whose words will form her childish mind to the practice of virtue. . . . One of soft and tender years is pliable for good or evil; she can be drawn in whatever direction you choose to guide her," etc., etc.

²Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XVI, 187-239, translated in *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, 2d Ser., Vol. X.

³"Virgo erat non solum corpore, sed etiam mente, quae nullo doli ambitu sincerum adulteraret affectum; corde humilis, verbis gravis, animi prudens, loquendi parcius, legendi studiosior, . . . intenta operi, verecunda sermone . . . eos solos solita coetus virorum invisere, quos misericordia non erubesceret, neque praeteriret. Nihil torvum in oculis, nihil in verbis procax, nihil in actu verecundum."

suffice to compel belief in direct borrowing. Such a conclusion seems, however, inescapable, when we juxtapose with the several traits of Virginia those of Ambrose's ideal. I note many parallels that seem to remove all doubt.

(1) Compare with "Discreet she was in answering alway" the words of Ambrose (III, iii, 9): "Not to answer a question is childishness, to answer is nonsense. I should prefer, therefore, that conversation should rather be wanting to a virgin than abound."⁴

(2) We are told of Virginia,

Bacus hadde of hir mouth right no maistrye;
For wyn and youthe doon Venus encrece.

Far closer to Chaucer than the passage cited from Ovid by Skeat is Ambrose's sentence (III, ii, 5), "Use wine therefore, sparingly, in order that the weakness of the body may not increase, not for pleasurable excitement, for wine and youth alike kindle a flame."⁵

(3) Compare with Virginia's avoidance of "festes, revels and dances, that been occasions of daliaunces" Ambrose's prohibition (III, v, 25): "There ought then to be the joy of mind, conscious of right, not excited by unrestrained feasts, or nuptial concerts, for in such modesty is not safe, and temptation may be suspected where excessive dancing accompanies festivities. I desire that the virgins of God should be far from this."⁶ A maiden's danger from light company, on which Chaucer touches, is more than once the theme of Ambrose (II, ii, 10; III, iii, 9).

(4) Like Chaucer, Ambrose brings his lesson home to fathers and mothers (III, vi, 31): "What say you, holy women? Do you see what you ought to teach, and what also to

⁴"Interroganti non respondere, infantia: respondere est fabula. Deesse igitur sermonem virgini, quam superesse malim."

⁵"Modico itaque vino utere, ne infirmitatem corporis augeas, non ut voluptatem excites; incendunt enim pariter duo, vinum et adolescentia."

⁶"Debet igitur bene consciae mentis esse laetitia, non inconditis comensationibus, non nuptialibus excitata symphoniis; ibi enim intuta verecundia, illecebra suspecta est, ubi comes deliciarum est extrema saltatio. Ab hac virgines Dei procul esse desidero."

unteach your daughters? . . . She who is modest, she who is chaste, let her teach her daughter religion, not dancing. And do you, grave and prudent men, learn to avoid the banquets of hateful men."⁷ The figure of the sheep among wolves, which Chaucer employs in the guise of a well-known proverb, is a commonplace in Ambrose's treatise (II, iv, 28, 30, 31).

(5) The fair fame of Virginia, "Thurgh that land they preysed hir echone," finds its parallel in the high repute of Mary (II, ii, 10): "How her parents loved her, strangers praised her!"⁸

(6) Virginia's walk toward the temple with her mother—an incident that assumes this form only in Chaucer's version of the story—seems to be suggested by Ambrose's description of Mary (II, ii, 9, 14): "She was unaccustomed to go from home, except for divine service, and this with parents and kinsfolk. . . And so Mary did not go even to the temple without the guardianship of her modesty."⁹ Perhaps the mother's companionship in the walk to the temple was partly due to Ambrose's enigmatic phrase (II, ii, 15): "Virgo intra domum, comes ad ministerium, mater ad templum."

(7) Chaucer's pathetic passage, in which Virginia chooses death rather than dishonor, has no parallels in variant versions of the tale and is obviously modeled upon the ready self-sacrifice of virgin martyrs in the many examples cited from Jerome by the Franklin, or in such a story as that of Saint Pelagia narrated by Ambrose (III, vii). Indeed the speeches of Virginius and Virginia before the maiden's death recall Pelagia's words in her

⁷"Quid dicitis vos, sanctae feminae? Videtis quid docere, quid etiam dedocere filias debeat? . . . Quae vero pudica, quae casta est, filias suas religionem doceat, non saltationem. Vos autem, graves et prudentes viri, discite detestabilium hominum epulas vitare."

⁸"Quid enim in singulis morer, ut eam parentes dilexerint, extranei praedicaverint, etc."

⁹"Prodire domo nescia, nisi cum ad ecclesiam conveniret, et hoc ipsum cum parentibus, aut propinquis. . . Nec ad templum igitur Maria sine pudoris sui custode processit."

last hour: "'What are we to do' says she to herself, 'unless thou, a captive of virginity, takest thought? I both wish and fear to die, for I meet not death, but seek it. . . God is not offended by a remedy against evil, and faith permits the act. . . I am not afraid that my right hand may fail to deliver the blow, or that my breast may shrink from the pain. I shall leave no sin to my flesh. I fear not that a sword will be wanting. I can die by my own weapons.'"¹⁰

(8) On account of its place in the context, Chaucer probably owes the suggestion of the Jephtha story, cited by Virginia, to the prominence of Jephtha and his daughter in Ambrose's treatise, "De Virginitate" (cap. i-iii)¹¹ which supplements the "De Virginibus."

Enough has been said to show the indebtedness of Chaucer's "gem of chastity" to the "consecrated virgin" type of Ambrose.¹² In his "ensample" of the Deadly Sin of Lechery¹³ how could Chaucer better exemplify its anti-type than by a generous use of the great Bishop's highly famed record of the traditional traits of Virginity?

¹⁰"'Quid agimus,' inquit, 'nisi prospicias, captiva virginitatis? Et votum est, et metus est mori; quia mors non excipitur, sed adsciscitur. . . Deus remedio non offenditur, et facinus fides ablevat. . . Non timeo ne dextera deficiens non peragat ictum, ne pectus se dolore subducat. Nullum peccatum carni relinquam. Non verebor, ne desit gladius. Possumus mori nostris armis, etc.'"

¹¹Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, XVI, 266 f.

¹²Twice in his writings Chaucer cites Ambrose by name: first in a second-hand reference in the *Second Nun's Tale* (G. 271), to the Preface of the Missa Ambrosiana on the Feast of St. Cecilia (Holthausen, *Herrigs Archiv*, LXXXVII, 269); and later in the Parson's quotation (I. 82) from a passage in the Bishop's sermons.

¹³As an *exemplum* of Lechery and Chastity the Virginia story figures even in Elizabeth's time. The title of the old edition of the well-known morality, *Appius and Virginia* (1575) reads thus: "A new Tragicall Comedie of Apius and Virginia. Wherein is lively expressed a rare example of the virtue of Chastitie by Virginia's Constancy in wishing rather to be slaine at her owne Fathers hands then to be dishonored of the wicked Judge Apius." Mackenzie's unhappy comment upon the moral of the story (*The English Moralities*, 1914, p. 13) ignores utterly its traditional function.

II. JEROME AND THE SUMMONER'S FRIAR

In the face of the Summoner's slighting reference to "Jovinian" (D 1929) it seems surprising—if the oversights of Chaucer scholars can any longer awake surprise—that no one has marked the large indebtedness of the *Summoner's Tale* to the famous tract of Jerome, "Against Jovinian,"¹ which had stood the Wife of Bath in such stead. All of the scriptural *exempla* of fasting put into the mouth of the friar are taken directly from one or two chapters in the second book of the treatise. I shall let the parallels tell their own story.

(1) *The Summoner's Tale*, D 1876 f.:

We han this worldes lust al in despyt.
Lazar and Dives liveden diversly,
And diverse guerdon hadden they ther-by.
Who-so wol preye, he moot faste and be clene,
And fatte his soule and make his body lene.
We fare as seith thapostle; cloth and fode
Suffysen us, though they be nat ful gode.

Compare *Adversus Jovinianum*, II, chap. 17: "Who tells of purple-clad Dives in hell for his feasting, and says that poor Lazarus for his abstinence was in Abraham's bosom; who, when we fast, bids us anoint our head and wash our face, etc." *Id.*, chap. 11: "Hence the Apostle says: 'Having food and clothing let us therewith be content.' . . . You have the world beneath your feet, and can exchange all its power, its feasts and its lusts . . . for common food, and make up for them all with a sackcloth shirt."²

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXII (II, 305), translated by Freemantle in *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, 2d Ser., VI, 346 f.

² "Qui Divitem purpuratum propter epulas narrat in Tartaro, et Lazarum pauperem ob inediam dicit esse in sinu Abrahae; qui quando jejunamus, ungi caput et lavari faciem praecipit, etc." "Unde et Apostolus: 'Habentes victum et vestitum, his contenti sumus' . . . Mundum habere sub pedibus et omnem ejus potentiam, epulas, libidines, . . . vilibus mutare cibis et crassiore tunica compensare."

(2) *The Summoner's Tale*, D 1885 f.:

Lo, Moyses fourty dayes and fourty night
Fasted, er that the heighe god of might
Spak with him in the mountain of Sinay.
With empty wombe, fastinge many a day,
Receyved he the lawe that was written
With goddes finger.

Compare *Adversus Jovinianum*, II, chap. 15: "Moses for forty days and forty nights fasted on Mount Sinai and showed even then that man does not live on bread alone but on every word of God. . . . Moses with empty stomach received the law written with the finger of God."³

(3) *The Summoner's Tale*, D 1890 f.:

and Elie, wel ye witen,
In Mount Oreb, er he hadde any speche
With hye god, that is our lyves leche,
He fasted longe and was in contemplanee.

Compare *Adversus Jovinianum*, II, chap. 15: "Elijah after the preparation of a forty days' fast saw God on Mount Horeb, and heard from Him the words, 'What doest thou here, Elijah?'"⁴

(4) *The Summoner's Tale*, D 1894 f.:

Aaron, that hadde the temple in governance,
And eek the othere preestes everichon,
In-to the temple whan they sholde gon
To preye for the peple and do servyse,
They nolden drinken, in no maner wyse,
No drinke, which that mighte hem dronke make,
But there in abstinence preye and wake,
Lest that they deyden; tak heed what I seye.
But they be sobre that for the peple preye,
War that I seye.

Compare *Adversus Jovinianum*, II, chap. 15: "Aaron and the other priests, when about to enter the temple, refrained from all intoxicating drink for fear they should die. Whence

³ "Moyses quadraginta diebus et noctibus jejunos in monte Sina etiam tune probans, non in pane solo vivere hominem sed in omni verbo Dei. Cum Deo loquitur. . . . Ille vacuo ventre legem accipit scriptam digito Dei."

⁴ "Elias quadraginta dierum jejuniu praeparatus Deum vidit in monte Oreb et audit ab eo, 'Quid tu hic, Elia?'"

we learn that they die who minister in the Church without sobriety."⁵

(5) *The Summoner's Tale*, D 1915 f.:

Fro Paradys first, if I shal nat lye,
Was man out chaced for his glotonye;
And chaast was man in Paradys, certeyn.

Compare *Adversus Jovinianum*, II, chap. 15: "So long as he (Adam) fasted, he remained in Paradise; he ate and was cast out; he was no sooner cast out than he married a wife. While he fasted in Paradise, he continued a virgin."⁶ It is significant that this very passage from Jerome is used by the Pardoner in his attack upon Gluttony (C 508 f.). Indeed, as has been often noted, the Latin is there quoted upon the margin of many manuscripts. This use of a common source in these two tales of the Sins is suggestive.

The evidence just presented disposes effectually of the view of the Globe editors, Dr. Pollard and his collaborators, that the "Jovinian," to whom the Summoner refers, "is probably the mythical emperor of the *Gesta Romanorum*." It is possible that, in the description of Jerome's adversary, "Fat as a whale and walking as a swan," Chaucer has in mind not only the passage cited by Skeat from the first book of the treatise (chap. 40), "iste formosus monachus, crassus, nitidus et quasi sponsus semper incedens," but the even less flattering sketch in the second book (chap. 21): "Nunc lineis et sericis vestibibus et Atrebatum ac Laodiceae indumentis ornatus incedis. Rubent buccae, nitet cutis, comae in occipilium frontemque tornantur, protensus est aqualiculus, insurgunt humeri, turgent guttur, et de obesis faucibus vix suffocata promuntur." But the lively similes are seemingly Chaucer's own.

The generous use by the Summoner of the Jovinian treatise furnishes another strong link

between Chaucer's Friar-Summoner tales and their immediate precursor, the contribution of the Wife, the largest borrower from Jerome's tract.

III. CHAUCER AND THE PRYMER

The indebtedness of Chaucer's "Invocacio ad Mariam," which prefaces his story of Saint Cecilia, to certain Latin anthems is now as fully recognized as the allegiance of these stanzas to Dante's *Paradiso*. Professor Holt-Hausen¹ long since revealed the relation of the fifth stanza to the *Salve Regina* and Professor Carleton Brown² has recently indicated the connection between lines 43-47 and the *Quem Terra*. Brown suggests that "the phrases which Chaucer took from this source had become so familiar to him through the liturgy and manuals of devotion that when he sat down to write this prayer of the Virgin, they came into mind unbidden." Neither scholar seems, however, to have recognized that the direct source of Chaucer in much of the Invocation was "The Hours of the Virgin," which forms so important a part of the *Prymer* or *Lay Folk's Prayer Book*.³

Ten minutes' examination of the contents of the *Prymer*—I use Littlehales' text of the English version, derived from an early fifteenth-century Cambridge manuscript⁴—discloses the presence of the *Salve Regina* in the Compline service of the Hours, and of the *Quem Terra* as the hymn for Matins. The former, in its English guise, is peculiarly interesting to the Chaucer student: "Hail, quene, modir of merci, oure liyf, oure swetnesse & oure hope, hail! to thee we crien, exiled sones of eue; to thee we sigen, gronyng in this valey of teeris; ther-for turne to usward thi merciful igen, & schewe to us ihesu, the blessid fruyt of thi wombe, aftir that we ben

⁵ "Aaron et ceteri sacerdotes ingressuri templum omne quod potest inebriare non potant, ne moriantur. Ex quo intelligimus mori eos qui in Ecclesia non sobrii ministrarint."

⁶ "Quamdiu jejunavit, in paradiso fuit; comedit et ejectus est; ejectus, statim duxit uxorem. Qui jejunos in paradiso virgo fuerat, etc."

¹ *Herrig's Archiv*, LXXXVII, 267.

² *Modern Philology*, IX, 1911, 1 f.

³ With the history of the layman's prayer book in England Brown has made us familiar in a valuable section of his study of *The Prioress' Tale*, Chaucer Society, 1910, pp. 126 f.

⁴ Early English Text Society, Orig. Ser., CV.

passid hennes. O thou deboner, O thou meke, O thou swete maide marie, hail!" Moreover, here in the *Horae* is the hitherto undisclosed source of Chaucer's lines (G 47-49):

and thou, virgin wemmelees,
Bar of thy body, and dweltest mayden pure,
The creatour of every creature.

A dozen times and more are the changes rung upon this *motif* in the *Prymer*—for instance in the anthems for Evensong: "*Post Partum*,—Aftir thi childberynge, thou leftist maide withouten wem;" "*Beata es Virgo*,—Blessed art thou, maide marie, that bar oure lord; thou brougtest forth the makere of the world, that made thee; & thou bileuest maide withouten ende." It is significant that the anthem for Sext (Midday), "*Rubum quem*,—Bi the busch that moises sig unbrent, we knowen that thi preisable maidenhede is kept," corresponds to Chaucer's figure both in the Prologue of the Prioress and in the *A. B. C.* (where he is merely following in the wake of DeGuilleville).

Chaucer's use of the *Prymer* in his Hymn to Mary seems not only natural but inevitable in the light of Patterson's statement in the Introduction to his *Middle English Penitential Lyric*⁵ (p. 22) that "the many poems that celebrate the joys of the Virgin go back ultimately to certain antiphons in the *Horae*." "The Hymn to the Virgin" (No. 30 of Patterson's collection) is "a mosaic of phrases, responses, versicles, lessons and scripture found in the *Horae*." In his large drafts upon the universally familiar Hours, Chaucer was but following the tradition of the religious lyric.

Another trait of the Invocation must now be remarked. No one has noted that such a prelude to a Miracle of the Virgin or to a Life of a saint is a literary convention even more common than the "Idleness" prologue.⁶

⁵ Columbia University Press, 1911.

⁶ To the interesting examples of "Idleness" introductions, cited by Brown in his *Modern Philology* article, may be added the Prologue of Henry Bradshaw's *Life of Saint Werburg* (E. E. T. Soc., Orig. Ser., LXXXVIII), ll. 71-84. See also Bradshaw's restatement of his purpose at the close of his work, II, 2006 f., "to avoyde slouth and idelness." It is

A few illustrations will serve as well as a score. Mark the short address to "Jesu Cryst, croune of maydenes alle," which opens Capgrave's "Life of Saint Catharine;"⁷ the appeal to the Maker, which prefaces another Life of this saint;⁸ the invocation to "Leuedi swete and milde," which ushers in the poem, "Coment le sauter noustre dame fu primes cuntroue" in MS. Digby 86, fol. 130;⁹ and what seems much to our purpose, the lines upon the Christ that begin the story of Saint Cecilia in the North English collection.¹⁰ Among the petitions that preface several Miracles of the Virgin in the Vernon MS.¹¹ is a thirty-line invocation to Jesus and Mary (introducing the fifth Miracle), which is thus paraphrased by the editor: "Jesus, Thou wast born of Mary and wast crucified for us, as Thou roset from the dead, freedest the souls in Hell, ascendedst into Heaven, and sentest the Holy Ghost to Thy disciples, we ought to thank Thee and Thy Mother. She is solace in every sorrow and never fails, though she oft delays." Very close to Chaucer's praise of the Virgin (G 56, 76) is the line, "In everi serwe or seknesse outhur, heo is sovereynest leche." The time-honored function of such a prelude as Chaucer's "Invocacio ad Mariam" constitutes good ground for believing that it was composed at the same time as the Life of Saint Cecilia.¹² The contention that the dexterity displayed by Chaucer

significant that Alexander Barclay, who launches his *Ship of Fools* with the Idleness convention (Jamieson's edition, I, 18), "But the speciyl cawse that mouethe me to this besynes is to auoyde the execrable inconuenyences of ydilnes whyche (as saint Bernard sayth) is moder of al vices," concludes his translation with an elaborate Invocation to the Virgin (II, 333 f.) richer even than Chaucer's in liturgical phrases.

⁷ E. E. T. Soc., Orig. Ser., C.

⁸ Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden*, N. F., p. 242.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 220.

¹⁰ *Id.*, p. 159.

¹¹ E. E. T. Soc., Orig. Ser., XCVIII.

¹² The argument for the synchronism of Invocation and Life is reinforced by the now generally accepted view that a similarly derived invocation, the Prologue of the Prioress—which the "quod she" of its second line assigns to the period of *The Canterbury Tales*—was composed at the same time as her Tale.

in blending various elements in the Invocation indicates a period of maturer powers than the Life itself ignores utterly the wide vogue of such "skilful mosaics." It is obviously unsafe to employ as a touchstone of a great poet's ripeness the sort of thing that every rimer of his time does well.

Yet whether, as custom clearly shows, the "Invocacio ad Mariam" was composed at the same date as the story of Saint Cecilia, or whether, as has been unhappily contended, it was a later insertion, there is, of course, no doubt that the prologues, which represent the written rather than the spoken word and are connected with no narrator,¹³ and the tale were combined at a period prior to the composition of *The Canterbury Tales*. Nowhere, however, in the whole range of Chaucer's reading could the poet have found, nor could he have put together for the nonce, any matter better suited to the illustration of Sloth than this treasure-trove of his portfolio with its opportune combination of Idleness prologue, Invocation full of the spiritual devotion that is ever the antidote of this Deadly Sin, and finally, the tale of the traditionally busy Saint Cecilia.¹⁴

IV. A PARALLEL TO THE PARSON'S SERMON

By the dexterous methods of attenuation now in high favor among certain scholiasts of our older literature it would be easy to devote many pages to the relation between Dan Jon Gaytringe's fourteenth-century "Sermon on Shrift," which is printed by Perry from Robert

¹³ Though the assignment of protests against Idleness to the Second Nun, a member of a notoriously slothful class, is ironically apt (*Publications of M. L. A.*, March, 1914), still there is no direct association of this material with that pilgrim. This necessary adjustment Chaucer relegated to the limbo of many of his undertakings, the morrow.

¹⁴ Further proof of Chaucer's indebtedness to the *Prymer* is the appearance of the *Domine, dominus noster* (Psalm VIII)—upon which the first stanza of the Prioress's Prologue is moulded—in the Matins service of the "Hours of the Virgin" immediately after the *Quem Terra*. The second and third stanzas of the Prioress are strongly reminiscent of several anthems of the *Horae*, particularly the *Ave Regina* and, as we have seen, the *Rubum quem*.

Thornton's ms. in the Lincoln Cathedral Library¹ and "The Lay Folk's Catechism" of Archbishop Thoresby, edited by Simmons and Nolloth from "the authentic copy in his register at York," and from the Wycliffite adaptation of this;² but the story of this connection shall be told very briefly. Gaytrik, who was deputed by Thoresby to draw up the Catechism, was no other than Gaytringe, as external evidence shows, and the treatise—though the fact is unsuspected by the clerical editors—is identical with the Sermon, published in an earlier number of the same series. Any reader who will take the trouble to examine the two documents will speedily become convinced of their essential oneness.

In this identity of Sermon and Catechism there is much to interest the student of Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*. "The chief solicitude of Archbishop Thoresby was for the poor Vicars who had the cure of souls, yet were often too meanly provided for"—for just such men as our Parson; and the Catechism was put forth "to amend the ignorance and neglect of the parish-priests and the consequent godlessness of their flocks."³ The wise prelate commanded all his clergy, parsons, vicars and priests to read diligently to their parishioners this Catechism, which contained the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, the Apostles' Creed, the Points of Belief, the Commandments, the Sacraments, the Works of Mercy, the chief Virtues and the Deadly Sins. Knowledge of these things must precede Confession. Hence Gaytringe's Sermon, the counterpart of the Catechism, merely teaches, "in scrifte how many thynges solde be consideride."

So with the Parson. In his Sermon he includes the conventional divisions of the Penitential—stock instructions to his flock. Under the second of the main-heads of Penance, Confession, he may well have comprised the formal themes of Gaytringe and the religious treatises of the period—the *Ayenbite*, the *Handlyng Synne* and various *Summae* and "Mirrors,"—

¹ *Religious Pieces*, Early English Text Society, 26, pp. 1-14.

² Early English Text Society, 118.

³ See Nolloth's "Introduction to the 'Catechism.'"

but he prefers to follow his source in limiting himself to the most important phase, the acknowledgment of Sins. And a comparison between the Parson's description of the Sins and the *formulae* of the Catechism and Prymers attests—if, indeed, the matter needs attestation—that Chaucer's parish priest voices the commonplaces of the fourteenth-century Confessional. The Parson thus appeals not only to the understanding but to the emotions of men who were wont to rehearse their Sins in this wise: "First, I knowlege my selfe gylty unto Almyghty God, unto our lady, saynt Mary, and to all the company of heuen. . . . that . . . I haue offended my lord God greuously and specially in the seuen deedly synnes. . . . I haue synned in pryde of herte . . . in pryde of clotyng: in strength: in eloquence: in beaute: in proude wordes . . .," and so through the other Sins.⁴

In the light of this relation between the Confessional and Penitential sermons, we can better appreciate the admirable aptness of Chaucer in making many of the Parson's hearers guilty of the Sins that the good priest afterwards exposes—sometimes in the very words of their own revelations.⁵ So far from allegorizing his pilgrims, the poet deepened their humanity in contemporary eyes by large illustrations of their characteristic vices, in which every reader freely and frequently confessed his share. Such men and women, erring sometimes confessedly but often unconsciously, were not only the proper audience for a Sermon on Shrift, but, by reason of their very faults, were flesh-and-blood beings entirely convincing to the medieval mind and heart.

FREDERICK TUPPER.

University of Vermont.

⁴Cited from a Salisbury Prymer by Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, II, 274. In this connection Patterson points to the many metrical renderings of such confessions or of separate portions of them (*Middle English Penitential Lyric*, p. 161).

⁵See my article, "Chaucer and the Seven Deadly Sins," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, March, 1914.

SCHILLER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD GERMAN AND ROMAN TYPE AS INDICATED IN HIS LETTERS¹

When reading Schiller's letters I noticed what seemed to be an inconsistency on the part of the poet in his attitude toward German and Latin type. A more complete investigation, however, and a chronological arrangement of the passages in question showed conclusively that the inconsistency was merely apparent, that in reality Schiller's attitude was clearly defined. It is only a matter of minor importance, but seems to have been quite overlooked by the "Schiller-Forscher." As the subject itself is of some general interest and has attracted considerable attention, the attitude of Germany's most popular poet is perhaps deserving of brief mention.

The references up to the year 1796 show a preference for the Roman type. On November 7, 1791 (No. 584), Schiller writes to Göschen, his publisher, regarding the periodical *Thalia*: "Dass Sie lat. Schrift nehmen, freut mich recht und ich denke, es wird sich der Mühe schon verlohnen." To his friend Wilhelm von Humboldt Schiller writes August 21, 1795 (No. 893): "Ihnen überlasse ich es ob lateinische oder deutsche Schrift zum Almanach genommen werd(en) soll. Hätte Unger (the publisher) eine recht passende lateinische Schrift, so würde ich dieselbe vorziehen; doch bin ich nicht so sehr darauf gestellt, und es kommt ganz darauf an, wie Sie Seine Schrift Proben finden." To his publisher Cotta he writes, October 31, 1796 (No. 1121): "Dass Sie dieselbe Lettern, wie bey der erstern (Ausgabe des *Almanach*) beybehalten, ist gar nicht nöthig. Ich selbst wünschte kleinere Lettern, (obgleich auch lateinische)."

In the letters up to 1796 I found but one instance where a preference for German type was expressed, and that, too, is noteworthy. In a letter to Cotta, October 2, 1794 (No. 753),

¹The quotations are from *Schillers Briefe* edited by Fritz Jonas, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. The numbering of the letters is that of Jonas.

we read: "Wir (*i. e.* Schiller, Goethe and possibly also Hofrath Schütz, who is mentioned in the preceding paragraph of the letter) sind der Meinung, dass Deutsche Schrift der lateinischen vorzuziehen sey." It is to be noted that in this instance Schiller uses the first person plural, not the first singular. He is stating not his own preference, but the decision of several.

In these earlier references no reason, no cause is given, it is simply the statement of a personal preference.

In later letters, from 1799 on, there is a change in Schiller's attitude. To the publisher Crusius he writes, November 29, 1799 (No. 1524a): "Ich wünsche *deutsche* Schrift zu den Gedichten, weil ich aus Erfahrung weiss, dass man ein Buch dadurch in weit mehr Hände bringt." Very similar are the words written to the Jena printer Göpferdt, May 20, 1800, regarding this same collection of poems (No. 1584): "Auch können Sie Herrn Crusius versichern, dass es eigentlich *sein* Vortheil ist, und nicht der meine, warum ich auf der Deutschen Schrift bestehe, denn mir ist bekannt, dass im Südlichen Deutschland viele, welche gern solche Werke kaufen, die lateinische Schrift nicht lesen können." Less suggestive is the following, taken from a letter to Cotta, dated October 8, 1802 (No. 1821): "Was die Ausgabe meines Theaters betrifft, so überlasse ich Ihnen ganz das wo und wie. . . . Zu lateinischer Schrift kann ich aus vielen Gründen nicht raten."

Especially instructive, however, is the passage contained in a letter to Cotta relating to the printing of *Tell*. It bears the date May 28, 1804 (No. 1971): "Was den Druck betrifft, so überlasse ich es Ihnen ganz ob Sie gleich 2 Editionen eine in lateinischer, die andre in deutscher Schrift machen wollen. . . . Wollen Sie aber bei Einer Ausgabe bleiben, so wird sie wohl mit deutschen Lettern am besten seyn, weil der Tell doch auch vom Volke wird gelesen werden."

Just as in the period up to 1796 I noted but one passage advocating the use of German type, so in these later letters I ran across but one in which a preference for Latin type is

shown, but that one is also significant. It is in a letter to the publisher Crusius regarding the planned *édition de luxe* of Schiller's poems. It is dated March 10, 1803 (No. 1855): "Eine Prachtausgabe der Gedichte wird mir recht sehr angenehm seyn, und ich weiss auch, dass man im Publicum sie wünscht. . . . Lateinische Schrift ist zu einer Prachtausgabe wohl nothwendig."

Viewing these quotations as a whole, the following conclusions may, I think, be drawn. Schiller's personal preference was for the Latin type, and in the case of an *édition de luxe*, a "Prachtausgabe," where the book even as a book should appeal to the aesthetic sense, he deemed this type necessary to the end of his life. On the other hand, experience taught him that his works could gain widest recognition and popularity only if printed in German type—he tells us directly that in South Germany and among the humbler classes Latin type was not merely a hindrance to ready comprehension but at times, even in the case of lovers of literature, an insurmountable obstacle.

Naturally and rightly, Schiller subordinated his own artistic preference to the existing conditions of his day. It is, however, interesting to see how modern he really was.

M. BLAKEMORE EVANS.

Ohio State University.

THE SEVEN LIBERAL ARTS IN LOPE DE VEGA'S *ARCADIA*

In the fifth book of Lope de Vega's pastoral novel entitled *Arcadia*,¹ composed between the years 1591 and 1594 and first published in 1598, the wise Polinesta conducts the shepherds Anfriso and Frondoso to an immense palace containing eight halls presided over by

¹For the best account of the *Arcadia*, see Dr. Hugo A. Rennert's monograph, *The Spanish Pastoral Romances*, 2nd edition, Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures, Philadelphia, 1912, pp. 142-156, and the same writer's *Life of Lope de Vega*, Glasgow, 1904, pp. 100-104.

eight maidens, Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Arithmetic, Geometry, Astrology, Music and Poetry. Each of these explains in verse to the shepherds the purpose and function of her art and the walls of each room are decorated with portraits of those who were regarded as the founders of that particular branch of human knowledge. We naturally expect to find here an allegorical treatment of the studies of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, with the addition of poetry, indicating the progress attained in the seven liberal arts at the end of the sixteenth century. As a matter of fact, Lope de Vega copied almost literally the facts stated in the first six chapters of the *Vision delectable* of Alfonso de la Torre, probably composed between 1430 and 1440 and published about the year 1480.

I have shown elsewhere² that in writing the *Vision delectable* Alfonso de la Torre was indebted to the *Anticlaudianus* of Alanus de Insulis for most of his allegorical material, that the chapters on grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry and music are derived from Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* and that the chapter on logic is borrowed from Al-Ghazzālī's treatise on that subject included in his *Makāsīd al-Falāsifa*. The author seems to have been ignorant of the revival of classical studies which characterized the reign of John II and standing at the very threshold of the Renaissance in Spain, he represents the state of knowledge in the rest of Europe in the Dark Ages. In composing his treatise, he was content for the most part to translate from the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville which typifies the last stage and decadence of the age of compilations and he seems to have known little of the progress in the arts and sciences since that time.

² *The Seven Liberal Arts in the Vision Delectable of Alfonso de la Torre*, Romanic Review, Vol. IV. Chapters eight to nineteen of the First Part, which discuss the most important questions of scholastic philosophy and theology, are derived from the *Moreh Nebuchim* or *Guide of the Perplexed* of Maimonides. See J. P. W. Crawford, *The Vision Delectable of Alfonso de la Torre and Maimonides's Guide of the Perplexed*, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, Vol. XXVIII, 1913.

It would be futile and tiresome to establish the "deadly parallel" by printing side by side the portion of the fifth book of the *Arcadia* dealing with the seven liberal arts and the first six chapters of the *Vision delectable*. The allegorical description of the seven maidens, and the account of the portraits representing the founders of the various arts are copied almost textually from the *Vision delectable*, and the poems in octaves describing the purpose and function of the studies included in the *trivium* and *quadrivium* are merely incomplete summaries of the facts stated by Alfonso de la Torre. Even the omissions were made in an unintelligent fashion and Lope's only addition is a brief discussion of the nature of poetry, including an inordinately long list of well-known and unknown Spanish poets of his time.

If we looked no further for evidence to prove the contrary, the study of the indebtedness of Lope de Vega to the *Vision delectable* would lead us to believe that the work of Nebrija, Hernán Núñez Pinciano, Luis Vives, Sebastián Fox Morcillo and other scholars of the sixteenth century, was fruitless. We must admit, however, that in seeking information concerning the seven liberal arts in a medieval work which was entirely inadequate and antiquated at the time of its publication in 1480, the great dramatist was sadly lacking in critical acumen.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES ON SIR WALTER SCOTT

In a recent article in *Modern Language Notes*¹ attention is directed to an interesting misquotation of Chaucer made by Sir Walter Scott in the *Antiquary*. The passage under consideration is the motto before the tenth chapter, and the author of the article reminds us that Scott was frequently inaccurate in quo-

¹ J. R. Schultz, "Sir Walter Scott and Chaucer," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVIII, 246.

tation, especially in the matter of mottoes for chapter headings.

Another even more interesting example of this carelessness in citation occurs in *Rob Roy*, his next novel, at the beginning of the eighteenth chapter.² The motto in this case is

And hurry, hurry, off they rode,
As fast as fast might be;
Hurra, Hurra, the dead can ride,
Dost fear to ride with me?

It is credited to Bürger (signed "Burgher" in the first edition), and the lines are from the *Lenore*. The quotation as Scott has used it is not to be found in his own rendering of the ballad (1796) nor in that of any other translator. Yet all the lines are found in different parts of Scott's translation. The first two occur in the thirty-seventh stanza of *William and Helen* as

And, hurry! hurry! off they rode,
As fast as fast might be;³

and the only difference is in the punctuation. The last two lines of the motto are found in the forty-ninth stanza of the translation in inverted order and as the second and third lines of the quatrain. The entire stanza is

Dost fear? dost fear? The moon shines clear,
Dost fear to ride with me?—
Hurrah! Hurrah! the dead can ride!—
O William, let them be!

Scott's recollection of his own lines may have been modified by a reminiscence of Taylor's version which was published the same year as his own, for in the latter the last two lines of the motto appear in the order quoted and, save for one word, in the same language.

Hurrah! the dead can ride apace;
Dost fear to ride with mee?⁴

² I am indebted to Professor O. F. Emerson for this and other items.

³ *The Poetical Works of Walter Scott*, ed. John Dennis (Aldine Edition). London, George Bell & Sons, 1892, vol. V, p. 97.

⁴ Cf. *The Annual Register*, London, 1796; vol. XXXVIII, p. 499, St. 40. The two lines are repeated in St. 49 and St. 50. For this reference I am under obligation to Prof. Emerson's paper on the translations of Bürger's *Lenore*, read at the last meeting of the Modern Language Association.

Perhaps it may be possible to suggest a reason why Scott should be thinking of the ballad at this time. *Rob Roy* is considered to some extent autobiographical, and in Miss Vernon is generally recognized a sweetheart of Scott's youth. With this fact in view, I venture to suggest that the passage,

"'There is a great deal of it,' said she, glancing along the paper and interrupting the sweetest sounds which mortal ears can drink in,—those of a youthful poet's verses, namely, read by the lips which are dearest to him."⁵

may have been based upon his own experience when the lady he was fond of read his translation of the *Lenore*. If there is any truth in this supposition, Scott may have had in mind the incident which occurs in *Rob Roy* only two chapters before the *Lenore* quotation, when he wrote the motto. The remarkable shuffling of lines can easily be accounted for by his habitual inaccuracy.⁶

Apropos of Scott's freedom in quotation, we are told by Lockhart⁷ that in correcting the proof sheets of the *Antiquary*, the novelist first began to give his chapters mottoes of his own invention. The biographer says:

"On one occasion he happened to ask John Ballantyne, who was sitting by him, to hunt for a particular passage in Beaumont and Fletcher. John did as he was bid, but did not succeed in discovering the lines. 'Hang it, Johnnie,' cried Scott, 'I believe I can make a motto sooner than you will find one.' He did so accordingly, and from that hour, whenever memory failed to suggest an appropriate epigraph, he had recourse to the inexhaustible mines of 'old play' and 'old ballad.'"

The motto alluded to is probably at the head of chapter thirty:

Who is he?—One that for the lack of land
Shall fight upon the water—he hath challenged
Formerly the grand whale; and by his titles
Of Leviathan, Behemoth, and so forth.

⁵ *Rob Roy* (Centenary Edition), Edinburgh, Adam and Charles Black, 1890, p. 200.

⁶ See circumstances of his translating *Lenore*:—Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. I, chap. VII, pp. 216-7 (Cambridge Edition), 1902. See also Adam Scott, *Sir Walter Scott's First Love*, pp. 51-2. Edinburgh, 1896.

⁷ *Ed. cit.*, vol. III, p. 106 (chap. XXXVII).

He tilted with a sword-fish—Marry, sir,
The aquatic had the best—the argument
Still galls our champion's breech.

—Old Play.*

All the mottoes of the chapters preceding this, with the single exception noted above, are credited to known authors; but ten of the fourteen following are signed "Old Play." A further examination of the novels shows that only one motto was chosen from an unknown or fictitious source before Scott wrote the *Antiquary*. This one is before the forty-eighth chapter of *Guy Mannering*, and the signature, "Old Border Ballad," merely indicates that he had forgotten what he derived it from. As a matter of fact, he was quoting the thirty-fourth stanza of the ballad, *Kinmont Willie*, included in his own collection, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*.⁹ In novels following the *Antiquary*, Scott quoted from "Old Play" ninety-one times, "Old Ballad" twenty times, "Old Song" seven times, "Anonymous" (which was probably employed in the same way) twenty-five times, "Old Poem" once, and "Ancient Drama" once; and in nearly every case the motto is believed by Dennis and other editors to be the novelist's own work.

WALTER GRAHAM.

Columbia University.

The History of the Chorus in the German Drama, by ELSIE WINIFRED HELMRICH. New York, Columbia University Press, 1912. 8vo., paper, pp. ix + 95.

This book represents the development of the chorus 1. in the early church-plays, 2. under the influence of the Latin comedy, 3. from

* The *Antiquary*, p. 280 (ed. cit.). The epigraph of chapter twenty-six, which later is signed "Old Ballad," appears without signature in the first edition.

⁹ *Guy Mannering*, chap. XLVIII, p. 344 (ed. cit.). *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. II, p. 64 (Ed. Henderson, Edinburgh, 1902). The epigraphs of chapters six and forty-five were not signed in the first edition. Later, they were credited to "As You Like It" and "Shenstone." *Waverley* has no mottoes.

Gryphius to Gottsched, 4. in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The undertaking is ambitious and the difficulties that beset it are great. Not the least of these is that, for the second and third periods treated, the country's resources in texts are inadequate. It is a sad fact that in spite of the efforts of Kürschner, Goedeke and Tittmann, Hermann and Scamotolski, and others, the number of reprinted texts is comparatively small. Of course, those plays that are remarkable from an esthetic point of view have mostly been reprinted, but it is not always in the most artistic dramas that the most significant changes in the development of dramatic forms occur. There are, I believe, a certain number of original seventeenth-century editions scattered through the libraries of this country, but they are practically out of reach, unless they happen to be in one of the two or three largest universities.

It may be tempting to trace the beginnings of the chorus in the medieval drama and to proclaim its triumph in Wagner, but the facts do not seem to me to warrant the assumption. There may be a superficial resemblance between the development of Greek tragedy and the relation between the medieval drama and the liturgical chant, but the cases are far from being similar. As Miss Helmrich says herself (p. 2): "Even before the dramatic element had begun to develop, the [ancient] chorus had reached an artistic form." It had become a lyric form of art, which took its place in the dialogue and combined with it, thus forming an organic whole, in which its function became more and more definite. Aristotle based his definition of it on the loftiest achievements of Greek tragedy. A chorus is a specific element of the drama: we have admirable examples of it; its functions have been defined by one of the world's finest critics, and even if he had not been a Greek philosopher of the highest standing, writing about artists who were almost his contemporaries, and with a broader experience than any of our philologists can hope to have, nobody could impeach his *a posteriori* remarks about the functions of the chorus. Therefore it seems hardly scientific to declare that one

will "use the term chorus when referring to the choir" (p. 12) of medieval liturgy. The choir is not a definite form of art. After the dialogue of medieval drama had sprung from it, it did not take its place in the drama, assuming an organic function. Miss Helmrich must repeatedly have felt the sterility of her parallel; at least, some of her own very sensible conclusions should have brought it home to her. Summing up this chapter, Miss Helmrich finds that "one cannot really speak of the evolution of the chorus in the religious drama" (p. 21). How could a thing which never became an organic part of the drama be expected to evolve? One might as soon expect the butterfly's cast-off chrysalis to develop.

I do not so completely disagree with the author when she tries to identify Wagner's music with the chorus. And yet, it will not do to simply tell us that "the rôle played by the [modern] orchestra is *much the same* as that played by the chorus in the Greek tragedy" (p. 86). Such is Wagner's opinion, I know, but is it safe to base a whole investigation on such a vague statement? In my opinion, Wagner's music is not a real chorus. It cannot be said to fulfil, in anything like the original sense, the first two functions assigned to it by Aristotle, *i. e.*, be an actor in the play, and be an inherent, *i. e.*, an indispensable part of the whole. As to the third requisite, it all depends on one's personal interpretation of "*συμναγώλῃσθαι*." It is true that, according to the best of those interpretations, the orchestra might at least partly fulfil it: whether one agrees with Schiller's conception of the chorus as "furthering and accompanying the plot," or thinks with Baumgart that it should contribute to bring about the *katharsis*, or credits it with the novel but important function of starting emotions among the spectators, as Hirn suggested.

Miss Helmrich does not appear to be firmly enough grounded in the history of the theories of the chorus. It is a great pity that she did not make use of Dr. W. F. Klein's excellent book (*Der Chor in den wichtigsten Tragödien der französischen Renaissance*, Erlangen, 1897), the first 51 pages of which treat with authority

of the development of the theories of the chorus from Aristotle down to the latest poetics, and which contains a discussion of Schiller's use of the chorus, so thorough as to make us rather critical towards later writings on the same theme. Klein ignores German criticism before Gottsched, in which he may be wrong. But it is nevertheless to be deplored that, even for seventeenth-century Germany, Miss Helmrich should have had to rely exclusively on G. Popp. I should have liked Miss Helmrich's method better if her book had been one for which the ground had been sufficiently prepared by a series of reliable '*Vorarbeiten*.' But this subject, as seen here, is new. Klein's book seems to me to show the safest way of approaching the subject: a painstaking way, to be sure, not fertile in direct large results, a little too German, perhaps, for the practical trend of our time, but the right way nevertheless. Klein knows the theories in detail, and then analyzes a number of tragedies and their choruses with an eye to the three aspects of the Aristotelian definition: the technical, the material, the dramaturgic. He completes this by metrical studies and esthetic valuations.

Let us now turn to some less general points. Following Creizenach, Miss Helmrich states that Reuchlin introduced choruses into his *Henno*¹ in imitation of Greek comedy. She quotes Reuchlin's commentary to the word "comedian" in line 3 of the prologue, but the passage from Diomedes which she adds in a footnote is not convincing. If anything, this passage, ending as it does with the express statement "*Latinae igitur comoediae chorum non habent*" would have deterred Reuchlin from introducing choruses into his Latin comedy. Furthermore, this passage refers to Greek comedy in general, not to one *aetas*. It is more likely that the passage referred to, if any, is this one (Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, I, 489): "*secunda aetate fuerunt Aristophanes, Eupolis et Cratinus, qui et principium vitia sectati acerbissimas comedias composuerunt.*" But

¹ I am surprised that Miss Helmrich should have been unable to obtain Reuchlin's *Henno*, which has been reprinted, together with his *Sergius*, by Holstein, in 1888.

whether he had the choruses or the general nature of the play in mind, when he marked it as a comedy of the ancient Attic type, we do not know. To be sure, the play may be considered as a satire of astrologers and lawyers, and that may explain the association with the three dramatists he mentions. It seems to me less probable that he was thinking of the choruses, especially in Aristophanes and Eupolis, where they began to dwindle away, till they entirely disappeared in the so-called "intermediate comedy." Nevertheless Miss Helmrich's idea of Greek influence on Reuchlin, even in the matter of the chorus, is very probably right. Holstein (l. c., p. 145) thought that the chorus might have been introduced for the sake of the music, Reuchlin's patron, Bishop Johann von Dalberg, being a great lover of music. Creizenach (II, p. 48) also points out that Reuchlin's own love of music might have brought him to do so. That the idea of writing a regular chorus in the Greek manner was in his mind is again suggested by his trying, in the commentary, to show how the choruses, at least the first two, are connected with the body of the play. Besides, Reuchlin has told us, in his *Sergius*, where he tentatively inserted his first chorus song:

Si senserit placuisse primitias suas
Faciet deinde integras comedias.

(*Sergius*, Prologus.)

It strikes me as rather comical when the author says of the meter of the Latin chorus songs (p. 39) that they are "generally . . . in iambic or trochaic dimeter, asclepiad, sapphic, glyconic or alcaic meter." What else generally?

Miss Helmrich may confuse our ideas about the early Reformation drama, first speaking, as she does, of a Swiss "Tendenzdrama" which she connects with Gengenbach's *Der Totenfresser* (not *Die*) and Nic. Manuel's *Ablaskrämer* (1525), and then surprising us by saying: "Then came the Reformation," etc.

To come down to matters of mere detail, I do not understand Note 44 of Chapter II. Did not also the audience of a Passion-play know the whole plot beforehand? The stage-direction "pausando" does not necessarily point to

instrumental music (p. 40). In Vondel's *Palamedes* there are not only two (p. 47), but four choruses, the others being a "Rey van Peloponnesers en Ithakoisen" and a "Rey van Trojaensche Maeghden."

Too much space would be taken up if all the problems that have been suggested by the reading of this book were to be stated here. Take, for instance, the question: why did the Humanists introduce a chorus at the end of the fifth act, whereas their greater familiarity with Latin tragedy could be expected to make them followers of Seneca, rather than induce them to develop a fashion which was still embryonic even in Greek tragedy? In how far did Horace's moralistic and didactic interpretation influence the chorus? How much havoc was worked by the misreading of "autoris partes" instead of "actoris"? What about the introduction of German choruses into Latin plays "für die kleinen Schüler, welche noch kein Latein verstehen," as Schöpferus said in 1602, or for other purposes? What was the precise relation between the chorus and the interlude, the chorus and the dumb shows, the chorus and the "lustige Person"? . . .

We have measured this book by an ideal standard, but this should not make us overlook its merits. It shows intelligent industry, clearness and forcefulness of thought, and creditable expression. It is the first book attempting to cover the subject as a whole. It contains many just and interesting remarks, and, as it stands, will certainly prove of use as a preliminary survey of the field.

JOS. E. GILLET.

University of Wisconsin.

Saint Vincent de Paul. Textes choisis et commentés par J. CALVET. Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1913. ii + 336 pp. (Bibliothèque Française, dirigée par F. Strowski.)

It was an excellent idea of Mr. Strowski's to include Saint Vincent de Paul in his collection of French classics of the seventeenth century, and it is to be hoped that the literary

importance of the great Apostle of Charity will soon be more generally recognized. Mr. J. Calvet, to whose care the present volume was entrusted, was well prepared for the task by his previous studies.¹ He illustrates the different phases of Saint Vincent's activity by ample extracts from his writings, principally his letters, prefacing them with helpful biographical and literary sketches.

For the student of French letters the chapter on *Le rôle national de Saint Vincent de Paul* is of especial interest. We perhaps tend to judge events like the Fronde from a rather narrow point of view. We are influenced by V. Cousin's sincere but romantic historical studies or by the egotistical narratives of a Retz or a La Rochefoucauld. But is not Saint Vincent de Paul, who intimated to the Queen that she was compromising herself in her relations to Mazarin (1643)² and who suggested to the mighty Cardinal to withdraw from the political field at least for a short while (1652),³ a witness more imposing than the peeved Frondeurs? His sympathies are with the suffering people, and he even implores the Pope to remedy the appalling misery of the country.⁴

Similarly, we see Port-Royal and the Jansenist movement almost exclusively as Sainte-Beuve saw them. Here again the letters of Saint Vincent show us a different aspect of the question. We realize that vital interests of the Church were at stake, that her unity was jeopardized and that the relations between Jansenism and Protestantism were of such a nature as to alarm any orthodox churchman.⁵ Saint Vincent had examined the points at issue as closely as any member of the Sorbonne and he knew his *Augustinus* perhaps as well as the author of the *Provinciales*: "Je vous avoue, monsieur," he writes to d'Horgny, Superior of the Mission in Rome, "que j'ai fait une petite étude touchant ces questions et que c'est le

sujet ordinaire de mes oraisons."⁶ His eloquent and indignant refutation of Arnauld's *Fréquente Communion* (letter 17, esp. p. 136) reminds us in its very temper of Pascal.

Interesting from the psychological point of view are the letters which Saint Vincent addressed to Mlle. Le Gras as her "directeur spirituel." His principles are sound and healthy; he is a man of practical piety, averse to all mystic inclinations. He repeatedly admonishes his almost too fervent correspondent "de procéder doucement," "de ne pas prendre certaines choses trop au criminel" and "de ne pas se surcharger de règles."⁷

The latter part of the book is devoted to the splendid activity of Saint Vincent as a missionary at home and abroad, and to his numerous *Conférences*. In the latter Saint Vincent uses his "petite méthode," which consists in plain preaching as the Apostles practised it: "tout bonnement, familièrement et simplement" (p. 244). This method was not without influence on Bossuet himself.

The question of the Missions leads Mr. Calvet to take issue with the view set forth by Mr. Raoul Allier that Vincent was one of the most active agents which the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement* used outside of its mysterious community.⁸ Calvet argues that on the contrary Vincent made use of the Company, whenever he thought it advisable (p. 95). Without entering into the details of this intricate question, a further argument in support of Calvet's opinion may be advanced. Allier himself admits that as late as 1634 Saint Vincent was ignorant of the very existence of the Company. In 1634, however, most of his charitable works were founded: the first *Confrérie de la Charité* in 1617, the Mission of the Galley-Slaves in 1624, the Congregation of the Mission in 1625 (approved by Urban VIII. in 1632), the *Enfants Trouvés* and the Ladies of Charity in 1634. If up to 1634 Vincent had been the very soul of all these foundations, can we reasonably assume that at any time he allowed him-

¹ Cf. *Revue Catholique des Églises*, June and September, 1904.

² See Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, vol. VII, p. 7.

³ Letter 14, p. 120.

⁴ Cf. Letter 13, pp. 116-118.

⁵ Cf. Letters 16 and 19, pp. 123, 128, 141.

⁶ Cf. Letter 16, p. 129.

⁷ Cf. Letters 4, p. 42; 17, p. 55; 9, p. 48.

⁸ R. Allier, *La cabale des dévots*, Paris, 1902, p. 59.

self to be used as the tool of a secret society, however laudable its purpose may have been?⁹

In the main, care seems to have been exercised in editing the selections, but a few typographical errors have slipped in.¹⁰ An index of names would have facilitated the use of the book.

WALTHER FISCHER.

University of Pennsylvania.

Business English. By EDWIN HERBERT LEWIS.
Chicago, LaSalle Extension University, 1914.

Business English, as defined by Mr. Lewis, is "such English as is used in mercantile transactions." Since it does not differ notably from the English used in most other transactions, his purpose is to point out, by means of illustrations and exercises drawn from the discussion of business topics, some of the established principles which govern effective expression. The book is deliberately simplified so as to be serviceable in the upper years of high schools as well as in the first year of technical colleges. It adopts a lightness, not to say breeziness, of tone that is obviously designed to relieve the dulness of correspondence-school study.

The qualities of style—interest and clearness, outlines, paragraphs, and connectives are treated somewhat scantily in brief chapters. Then follow chapters on various matters of usage, such as punctuation, the use of the hyphen, grammatical correctness, and on various aspects of diction. An appendix supplies exercises for each chapter.

The book is to be commended for its insistence on mechanical accuracy and on the value of words. A decent respect for usage and an appreciation of the worth and dignity of words are essential to the effective use of English of

any kind. On this account the work would serve well for a review of freshman English by sophomores who need further training in writing. The uniform reliance upon examples rather than upon explanation is another merit.

In the terms, "regular relative clause" and "extra relative clause," instead of the well-established *restrictive* and *non-restrictive* or *explanatory*, there is an unfortunate effort for simplicity. Neither clause is more regular than the other, and there is nothing extra about the second. The volume is unduly large for handling and carrying by students, and is none too clearly printed. A more specific index would seem desirable to make the helpful rules for mechanical details available for reference.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

Johns Hopkins University.

Die Variation in der altgermanischen Alliterationspoesie (Palaestra XLVIII), von WALTHER PAETZEL. Berlin: Mayer und Müller, 1913.

In 1905 Paetzel published his Berlin dissertation, of which the present work is an amplification and completion. The ever increasing body of literature which deals with the subject of variation has evidently been studied with care by Paetzel, although Behaghel's important work, *Beitr.* 30, 431 ff., seems to have escaped his notice. Paetzel, however, has apparently approached his subject with a more thorough knowledge of past and contemporaneous efforts in the same field than any of his predecessors. Especially valuable is his summary of the various conceptions of the term "variation" as it is understood and defined by other writers. In view of this it is especially disconcerting to find his own definition of variation so different from that of all others that he is discussing a practically new theme under the old familiar name. For the purposes of this article we may divide the various authorities on variation into two groups, first,

⁹ The texts quoted by Allier (pp. 60-62) seem far from conclusive, and later in the book (p. 139) he himself modifies the above-quoted sweeping statement.

¹⁰ Read, page 16, line 5: *son embarquement par le moyen duquel*; 40, 29: *ne vous fait connaitre*; 207, 21: *vous ne fassiez point exception*; 269, 12 and 17: *fétardise*.

those who define the term broadly and, second, those who would sharply limit its application in one way or another. Such a division is doubtless inevitable in the discussion of any stylistic element whose very nature makes sharp definition an impossibility. As a representative of the liberal group may be taken the definition of Pachaly in his work, *Die Variation im Heliand und in der altsächsischen Genesis*:

"Ihr Wesen ist aus der Musik bekannt. Es besteht in der auf mannigfache Art veränderten Wiederholung eines Begriffes. An einen Begriff, der den Ton angibt, werden ein, zwei, selbst drei und vier andere annähernd synonyme Ausdrücke angeschlossen; folgen mehrere, so klingt der Grundbegriff deutlich durch. Die Var. bringt also nichts absolut Neues hinzu, sie bringt nur Abwechslung, individuelle Züge, ein Hin- und Herwogen in die Darstellung und rechtfertigt so stilistisch begriffliche Tautologien."

This definition represents the common conception of variation or parallelism. As must, however, soon become apparent to every worker in this field, *some* limitation of the general conception is desirable. It has remained for Paetzel to so lose sight of the essential character of variation, as broadly defined above, that he offers us as a substitute for the whole a minute subdivision, which he assures us is really the only part worthy of consideration. His definition follows:

"Ein für das Verständnis genügend gekennzeichneter Begriff wird, entgegen dem Gebrauch der Prosa, noch einmal und zwar oft mit Unterbrechung des syntaktischen Zusammenhanges dem Hörer oder Leser vor die Seele gerückt. Diese Ausdrucksform nenne ich Variation. Ihre Hauptkennzeichen sind also 1. begriffliche, 2. syntaktische Entbehrlichkeit, woraus sich ergibt—3. seltenes Vorkommen in der Prosa" (p. 3 f.).

From the above we gain that Paetzel recognizes nothing as variation unless it be tautological as regards both syntax and meaning. Hence the possibility of variation is practically denied to prose style. Even appositive word pairs are excluded if connected by a conjunction (cf. p. 6). How artificial such differentiation is, appears from the fact that synonym-

ous words in other relations are freely admitted as examples of variation, as, for instance, p. 190 ff., where a number of examples are given as variations in which a preceding genitive is varied by a following nom. or acc. case. Here Paetzel makes syntactical relation all-important, even to the exclusion of that only element which can logically determine variation, namely, meaning. Evidently he has not forgotten his directly opposed method of treatment on p. 20, when he seeks to excuse the inconsistency of admitting sentences joined by conjunctions as examples of variation by recourse to a distinction between exactness of correspondence in meaning. As a matter of fact, by admitting such sentence variation to consideration at all he disregards the very principle which he emphasizes as most characteristic of variation—namely "syntaktische Entbehrlichkeit." He here throws himself open to the very criticism which he directs against those who interpret the meaning of variation more broadly—namely, "verschiedene Dinge in einen Topf zu werfen."

To sum the matter up, Paetzel's conception of variation is so limited as to apply only to one small manifestation of the subject. This detail he has studied with such concentration of attention as to render him insensible to the fact that what he is treating is not variation, but rather only a single phase of that great principle. It is therefore not surprising that his theory of the origin of variation should be equally limited. The "Erregung der dichterischen Phantasie" which he regards as its psychological and only basis, is of course one of the great underlying reasons for variation. However, it is *only one reason* out of many, and it would be as ridiculous to try to explain every example of variation by this principle as to assert that *Faust* is based solely on Goethe's experiences at Strassburg. Any such limited conception furnishes a delightfully easy solution, but it can scarcely satisfy those students who have not allowed a too close scrutiny of particulars to dim their vision of the whole subject. In fact, Paetzel himself could scarcely reconcile some of his own examples to this theory. Take, for example, *Beowulf*, ll. 2482b—

2483a (Paetzel, p. 79). Here the principle of "Erläuterung" which Paetzel refuses to accept as a basis of variation (p. 11) is self-evident. (On p. 25 a number of similar cases are excluded!) Such variations as he admits in considerable numbers would also be perfectly in place in prose and we need not have recourse to "poetic frenzy" for their explanation. Paetzel is, however, quite right in rejecting Panzer's fantastic explanation (p. 12) of the basis of variation as consisting of a desire to proceed from the particular conception to the general class. Every student of the subject must realize that the opposite procedure is much more common—a fact which Paetzel clearly shows by examples. The whole subject of the reasons underlying variation is too complex to be dismissed by a superficial treatment. Only a thorough psychologist with a broad knowledge of the literatures of many nations and periods may at some time be able to bring together the scattered threads and show how many different forces have been at work.

Any work on variation will necessarily always be open to the criticism of incompleteness and inconsistency. Not in a carping spirit, but rather with the purpose of pointing out the possibilities of the pitfalls into which even the most careful worker may fall, I would mention the following.

P. 14. A fourth class, covering adverbial variation, should be added to Paetzel's three classes. Such variation is especially common in Otfrid; cf. IV, 8. 1: *rumano joh ferro*.—P. 20. The statement that two words joined by a conjunction are scarcely ever exact synonyms, for "vollständige Synonyme gibt es so gut wie gar nicht," would in all justice seem to apply with equal force to asyndetical word pairs, and yet the latter are freely admitted as variations. Moreover, one asks, how can entire sentences correspond *exactly* in meaning, as Paetzel states just below, when *exact* word synonyms are impossible? In the last sentence on the same page the statement that "exact synonyms practically do not exist" is again inferentially contradicted by the phrase "Wortvar. deren Glieder wirklich ganz dasselbe

sagen, erscheinen stets ohne Konjunktionen." The whole method of reasoning seems to lack a firmly established working basis, since the author's assumptions apparently vary with the point which he is trying to prove. "Is exact correspondence of meaning essential to variation?" we ask. If so, why should it not be required of word variation as well as of sentence variation, and why should we be told that exact word synonyms are an impossibility and, a little later on, that exact word synonyms always appear without conjunctions?—P. 25 ff. The five pages (25–29) of so-called doubtful cases are a mute proof of Paetzel's difficulties in following out consistently his own self-imposed definition of the term variation. Why, for example, should Beowulf, ll. 1960–61, *Eomer—Hemminges mæg* be excluded, while the instance above mentioned (ll. 2482b–2483a) is included (Paetzel, p. 79) in the list of variations? The explanations on pp. 24, 25 are far from convincing.—P. 157. The results of the tests to which Paetzel subjects the material collected are naturally of greatest ultimate interest. However, I cannot approve of his method of estimating frequency of variation by ascertaining the relation between the total number of variations and the number of verses in the selection in question. This method is inaccurate since a single variation may cover several verses. The frequency of variation can best be measured by comparing the number of verses containing variation with the total number of verses. Thus a single variation ten verses long would, by Paetzel's method, give these ten verses only 10% of variation, whereas the actual relation is 100%. It is difficult also to understand why "lebende und leblose Wesen" and "Eigennamen" should be arranged in the table under "Form" rather than under "Content."

Material of real value is given us in p. 162 ff., where the relation of variation to epic, didactic and lyric style is discussed. Here the real nature of variation becomes clearer, and it is only to be regretted that the author's narrow conception of the term hinders him from attaining even more satisfactory results. To this same

limited conception, doubtless, is also due the fact that the author fails wholly to see in variation any criterion of age, or hint as to authorship (pp. 215-216). A more comprehensive survey of a considerably more limited field might have led to clearer results.

P. R. KOLBE.

Municipal University of Akron.

Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske. Compiled by HALLDOR HERMANSSON. Ithaca: Cornell University Library, 1914.

Altogether too few Germanic scholars are aware of the treasures which the Library of Cornell University houses in its fine building on the hill crest overlooking the valley of Lake Cayuga. I refer particularly to the Fiske Icelandic collection. To those who have not visited Cornell Library, which, by the way, in the same wing contains the same bibliophile's famous Dante and Petrarch collections, the present monumental catalogue will be a revelation.

A stately quarto volume of 755 pages on good paper, it is a handsome testimony, not only to the gifted owner's zeal and energy, but also to the indefatigable industry of the present curator, to whose labors we already owe six volumes of bibliographical monographs in the annual *Islandica*.¹ A few facts concerning the history and nature of the collection will be interesting to not a few.

The collection "was bequeathed to Cornell

University by Willard Fiske, Professor of North-European languages and Librarian of the University from 1868 to 1883. He died on September 17, 1904, and the collection came to the University Library in the spring of 1905. Mr. Fiske had commenced collecting Icelandic works about the middle of the last century. The visit (to Iceland) which he finally made in the summer of 1879 doubtless gave him opportunity to add many volumes to his library, besides making him personally acquainted with the people in whom he had taken so great an interest ever since his college days. . . ." At his death, the collection "numbered about 8,600 volumes, including pamphlets. In his will Mr. Fiske provided for the maintenance and increase of it the income of \$8,000 annually, and at the time when this Catalogue went to press the Collection numbered about 10,200 volumes on the shelves (excluding the Runic portion containing some 500 volumes)."

"The contents of the collection may be briefly summarized as follows. In the first place it contains all the editions and translations of the Old Icelandic and Old Norse texts so far as these have been obtainable; works on that literature, such as histories and commentaries; works on the language, religion, history, manners, and customs of the Scandinavian nations in early times, principally, of course, of the Norwegians and Icelanders; archaeological and ethnographical works; in short, all publications which, in one way or another, elucidate the Old Icelandic literature, the periods involved, and the subjects with which it deals, including even writings of modern authors in various countries, such as poems, novels, and dramas which have been influenced by that literature. In the second place, the collection comprises the modern Icelandic literature since the sixteenth century, beginning with the first book printed in Icelandic, the New Testament of 1540, thus covering Icelandic books, pamphlets, and periodicals, whether printed in Iceland or elsewhere, as well as writings of Icelanders in other languages than their own, and other works in foreign languages dealing with Iceland, the nature of the country, and its affairs; or, as Mr. Fiske himself expressed it, it

¹ Ithaca, 1908-13. I, Bibliography of the Icelandic sagas and minor tales, 1908; II, The Northmen in America, 1909; III, Bibliography of the sagas of the kings of Norway and related sagas and tales, 1910; IV, The ancient laws of Norway and Iceland, 1911; V, Bibliography of the mythical-heroic sagas, 1912; VI, Icelandic authors of to-day, 1913. A catalogue of the Runic library, formerly a part of the Icelandic collection, is in preparation.

embraces 'all the annals, travels, natural histories, government documents, ecclesiastical writings, biographies, and bibliographies, which can, in any way, throw light on the history, topography, indigenous products, commerce, language, and letters of Iceland.'"²

The broadness of interpretation of the term "Icelandic" as well as the virtual completeness of the collection, especially in conjunction with the very good Germanic library of the University, render Ithaca the only place in this country where research on the subject in all its aspects can be carried on. In fact, the collection is "the richest in existence, with the exception of the National Library in Reykjavík and the Royal Library in Copenhagen."

To be sure, there are hardly any mss.³ On the other hand, there is a surprising wealth of rare early books, reprints now difficult to procure, presentation and personal copies, frequently containing the autographs, notes, and reviews of noted scholars; also, of rare pamphlets, newspaper articles, etc. The collection is particularly rich in old printed bibles, graduals, psalmbooks, and books of devotion. Among the *curiosa* of the collection are the volumes of *grafskriptir* (epitaphs and obituary poems), *erfiljóð* (commemorative poems), and *tækifæriskvæði* (poems written for special occasions). These are all published separately and distributed at the funeral, wedding, etc., of the person in question, a custom which has been much observed in Iceland during the last century.⁴ In all probability it is a belated survival of the *Gelegenheitsdichtung* which flourished so abundantly on the continent of Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Each collection contains some 300 entries ordered to a nicety.

It is amusing to note that no less than 117 individuals with the patronymic Jónsson—of which number again 22 are Jón Jónssons—have been busy in a literary way; among them such shining lights as the learned priest Arn-

grim Jónsson (1568–1648), author of the *Crymogæa*; Runólfur Jónsson whose *Lingua Septentrionalis incunabula* was published together with Hickes' *Institutiones grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonica et Mæso-Gothica*, 1688; the historians Björn Jónsson and Bishop Finnur Jónsson; the poet Kristján and Hjalmar Jónsson; and Finnur Jónsson, the greatest living scholar in the wide realms of Old Norse language and literature.

It is rather humiliating to note that some of the best sagas still await the translator, as *e. g.*, the *Hrafnkelssaga Freysgoða*, the *Hervararsaga*, the *Gautrekssaga*, the *Hrólfs-saga kraka*—to mention only a few. Not even the famous *Speculum Regale* has ever been done into English.

The arduous work of cataloguing this great collection has been performed in an unexceptionable fashion. I have not discovered a single error in dates or pagination, notwithstanding the very numerous cross-references, and there are remarkably few misprints and omissions.

One of the most serious omissions is that of M. Lorenzen's *Gammeldanske Krøniker* and the cross-reference to G. Storm's *Kritiske Bidrag* (*Nyt Norsk Tidsskrift* I, 140, 388; and *Norsk Historisk Tidsskrift* 2den række I, 371). No mention is made of the *Publications of the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies* (Urbana, 1911, ff.). Under the heading "Older Edda" also the partial translations, as *e. g.*, those of Herbert Green and E. E. Kellett might have been listed. By an oversight the complete translation in Vol. I of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale* is omitted. The printing is flawless; only, it is very confusing to have a name continued on a succeeding page in black type (as if it were a new entry) without a "cont." or other sign to indicate the fact.

The subject-index at the end adds greatly to the usefulness of the catalogue; also the feature that the less known or older works are briefly characterized as to contents and treatment. This is well done.

L. M. HOLLANDER.

University of Wisconsin.

² I quote from the preface.

³ I note, though, a large vellum ms. of the *Jónsbók*.

⁴ As Mr. Hermannsson informs me.

Beginners' French, by MAX WALTER and ANNA WOODS BALLARD. New York, Scribner, 1914. xxvi + 249 pp.

When, in 1911, Direktor Max Walter of the *Musterschule* at Frankfort on the Main came to the United States, he not only aroused enthusiasm at the Teachers' College of Columbia University, where he gave a substantial course, but also at all the institutions he visited during his stay. Known as he is as the leading exponent of the so-called Direct Method of teaching modern languages, everyone was interested in hearing and seeing his exposition; and everyone who heard and saw was impressed. Since this first visit, Professor Walter, in collaboration with Miss Ballard of the Teachers' College, has brought out in book form the lessons he makes use of in instructing beginners in French.

As we look over this book, we see that the appeal to the student is to be made first through the ear and then through the eye. If this is to be the case, then a great deal of time and care must be taken in the beginning to help the student to acquire an accurate pronunciation of the syllabic elements; he must be taught to distinguish between open and close vowel sounds, to enunciate consonants clearly; he must be taught the correct basis of articulation of the foreign language. The authors advise the free use of phonetic transcription for this purpose. The student once well started upon his pronunciation, the actual lessons begin. These lessons are largely *leçons de choses*, the teacher relying upon such objects as he sees about him or can easily command as a basis for teaching vocabulary, the book itself providing seventeen illustrations. From the first there is also inductive teaching of grammar. Lessons I, II and IV, for example, are on the article, Lessons III, V, VI, VIII-X, XII, XIV-XVII, XXXII, XXXIX, XL bring in the present indicative, and the other lessons bear similarly on other important points. The authors say: "In French the chief difficulty is the verb. From the beginning an exact and thorough knowledge of the verb is striven

for and the drill on it continues throughout the book." Therefore, in order to give this drill, an action or a series of actions, somewhat as in the Gouin Method, is frequently made the basis of the lesson, and the students are called upon to repeat so far as practicable the action mentioned, at the same time describing it aloud. In this way the attention of the pupil is concentrated upon what he is doing, he learns how to describe his movements in the foreign idiom without having to make use of his mother tongue as a medium. The lesson once comprehended orally, the student writes it down and then by a variety of ingenious methods is induced to make use of the words and phrases just learned.

The book contains sixty-three lessons based upon things, actions, or brief passages of descriptive prose. The common forms of ordinary conversation are covered and a vocabulary of some two thousand words is introduced. Following the lessons are a few anecdotes for reading, a most condensed résumé of grammar, the table of irregular verbs, four songs with music, and the vocabulary. As far as the details of the text go, there seems to be room for little criticism. Misprints are few and unimportant; some rules are given as absolute which are subject to exception, but no one could object to this in a book for beginners; and one or two statements are made which are not literally true, though they give rise to no misapprehension on the part of the reader.

As a presentation of the Direct Method of teaching languages the Walter-Ballard book is more explicit and more complete than any which has hitherto appeared. The successful use of it will, however, depend upon various circumstances. In the first place the Direct Method makes a far greater demand upon the teacher than any of the older methods. The instructor must be able to pronounce the foreign language with some degree of accuracy, he must have some conversational ability in the foreign tongue, he must command the attention and respect of his class so that the pupils will not regard the very active work as kindergarten play without serious intent. Granted that the teacher is what he should be, to obtain practical

results with average pupils, the class must be small enough for every member to recite frequently during every period, and the periods must come with sufficient frequency, not less than four times a week, so that there may be no lapse between the lessons. As Professor Downer said at a recent convention, "if you have fifty-three students to call upon in a fifty-three minute recitation period, what oral work can you expect of each?" The problem is easy enough to solve provided the teacher remain absolutely silent. Lesson III of the Walter-Ballard opens with the words: "In this lesson the pupil speaks as he performs the actions already learned. The class, helped by the teacher, says what each pupil does. The teacher works with individuals and with the class until all can give fluent answers." There follow three pages of French for oral practice.

All who have had the privilege of hearing Professor Walter, know that he has made a success of the Direct Method, they also know that he would have achieved unusual results by any method he had chosen to use. It remains to be seen whether the average teacher of beginners can handle this strikingly personal method with success.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Prinz Friedrich von Homburg. Ein Schauspiel, von HEINRICH VON KLEIST. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by GEORGE MERRICK BAKER. New York, Oxford University Press, 1914.

About fifteen years ago Professor Nollen made accessible to students for the first time Kleist's masterpiece *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. His edition was creditable for its time, but very much has been done since its appearance to clear up obscure portions of the poet's life and set him in correct relation to his times. The older edition was dependent upon the state of our knowledge at that time, and much of

Professor Nollen's Introduction is now known to be in error.

A new edition is therefore highly desirable, but it ought to show an advance upon the older work, if it is to justify its printing. Unfortunately the new edition by Baker is a complete disappointment. Apparently the researches of Kleist scholars in recent years have been wholly ignored by the editor, who frankly holds that Brahm is "the final word on Kleist."

In literary importance Kleist stands so close to the greatest classics of Germany that it is a pity no good biography of him is accessible to English readers. Considering this fact, it would seem an editorial blunder to limit the biographical sketch to fourteen pages. The whole is so condensed, that the reader could get no adequate idea of the personality of the poet, the chronological sequence of the really important events of his life, or his relation to his age, even if they were correctly presented. The uninitiated reader of this sketch (and for such it surely is written) will either form no conception at all of the poet's career, or any one of a thousand distorted ones.

But brevity is not the chief fault. Fundamental errors abound. Kleist's love of Nature was not first shown either at Dresden or in the Harz in 1797, but was marked already as early as 1793, when he went to the army of the Rhein. With the works of Morris and Rahmer and the Letters of Kleist before him, no editor should treat the Würzburg journey in this wise: "Accompanied by one of the younger members of the group, Ludwig von Brockes, he started on a trip to Dresden by way of Leipzig and Würzburg. The immediate cause of this journey is unknown, but it may be inferred from one of his letters, that he intended to look over the industrial situation with a view to changing his employment. At any rate the sojourn in Würzburg and Dresden marks an epoch in Kleist's life. Here at last he finds himself and his true vocation. From the larva of the business man develops unexpectedly the full-fledged poet." As many blunders as sentences!

The assumption that Kleist referred to his drama *Robert Guiskard* in a passage from a

letter from Würzburg, "geschmückt mit den Lorbeern meiner That," is so baseless, that surely the editor must never have had the Letters before him, or at least never have examined the context. The *Guiskard* was begun in the spring of 1802 on the island of Delosea in Lake Thun, as the Letters show.

Ulrike did not refuse Kleist financial aid toward his purchase of an estate in Switzerland, but, on the contrary, the money was sent and arrived after the project had been given up for political reasons. The boisterous laughter with which the friends in Switzerland greeted the close of the *Familie Schroffenstein* was not exactly "unqualified praise and encouragement." Ulrike came to Switzerland in order to care for her sick brother, but found him already recovered. He was not "nursed back to health only by the loving care of his sister Ulrike." Kleist's departure from Switzerland was not merely a "taking up of the wanderer's staff" to restore his "equilibrium" by "change of scene and environment," but he went along, contrary to his previous plan, to help his friend Ludwig Wieland seem to get out of Bern voluntarily rather than by order of the government. This determined his visit to Weimar and Osmanstädt. It was probably not "a chance of happiness" that Kleist renounced on leaving Wieland's home, but an unexpected entanglement that threatened both career and honor. It is difficult to see how the poet's illness at Mainz in 1803-4 was really the means of saving his life, for the crisis was passed at Boulogne when Lucchesini's passports ordered him home to Potsdam. Ewald von Kleist was undoubtedly an illustrious kinsman, but not Heinrich's "ancestor."

These are by no means all the errors and misrepresentations that crowd the fourteen pages of this biography, but they are typical. The whole is vague, distorted, and nowhere enlightening.

The brief account of the history of Brandenburg up to the campaign of the Great Elector against Sweden, as well as the treatment of Kleist's sources, give the impression of off-hand compilation, their substance being drawn chiefly from Nollen's Introduction. The Interpreta-

tion of the Play gives the editor another opportunity to misrepresent the experiences of the poet and the message of the drama.

The Notes are unusually brief. A comparison of them with those of Nollen's edition shows that they were drawn almost entirely from the latter, often without change of phraseology, sometimes with considerable omissions. What Baker adds to Nollen is mostly grammatical, superfluous, or of no importance. What he omits is often of far greater importance than what he copies. Whatever deals with the drama's place in literature, its kinship with other plays or its dependence upon them, is generally omitted. When the copy is briefer than Nollen's original, the brevity often either spoils the sense or robs it of lucidity. See the Note to l. 783: "*von* — *Korn*, 'of the good old sort.' *Schrot* has reference to measure or quantity, *Korn* to fineness or quality." This tells nothing. Nollen gives the information that the phrase refers to coinage, *Schrot* indicating the proper size of the metal cut off for stamping and *Korn* the standard fineness of the metal. The Note to ll. 409 f. runs: "*läutete zur Andacht ein*, a confusion of two constructions. Either *zur Andacht* or *ein* should be omitted." The omission of *zur Andacht* would spoil the meaning. Nollen says that *läutete die Andacht ein* is the alternative to *läutete zur Andacht*. Note to l. 392: "*sprengt*, make run." We should have to say 'makes run' at any rate, but Nollen notes the causative relation of the verb to *springen*. Note to l. 545: "*In Staub*, more correctly *im Staub*." With *niedersinkt* the preposition *in* requires the accusative, and we have here simply *in=in'n=in den*, which Nollen admits may be the case.

In his Note to ll. 11-13 Baker selects the better of two commentaries offered by Nollen. As this seems to be the only case, it deserves mention.

There were opportunities to correct Nollen. Baker never seems to grasp them, but copies uncritically what he finds. So the Note to l. 280: "*stellt*; subject is Kottwitz understood" is copied verbatim from Nollen. But a glance at the text shows that this verb is a part of the

continuous text of the 'Parole' which is merely interrupted in dictation by other speakers. The subject is *Der Prinz von Homburg*—, l. 269. Again, Note to l. 493: "*du hörst*;" supply 'that we are ready,'" copied from Nollen. The present tense refers to the words of Kottwitz spoken but a moment before in ll. 477-481. Note to ll. 1264 ff.: "An invention of Natalie's. It is not probable that the Elector would entrust so important a matter to her." This follows Nollen. As Colonel of her regiment she takes the liberty to commit an insubordination herself, as a foil to the Prince's. Baker himself seems to have an inkling of this (p. xxxvii). Note to l. 1581: "*In den Sternen fremd*," either 'a stranger to high ideals,' or 'short-sighted,' as *kurzsichtig* in l. 1583." Again direct from Nollen. The phrase is derived from astrology, and implies inability to read the destinies of nations as shown by the positions of the planets; here, 'unwise in statecraft,' in assuming that future power can be secured by crushing out initiative in the army. In l. 1719 it matters little that *delph'sche* refers to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi; the whole point is that the oracles of Apollo were always capable of more than one interpretation. Neither editor notes this fact, though it is obviously Kleist's sole reason for mentioning the *delph'sche Weisheit* of the Generals. The Elector has just given a second interpretation of Hohenzollern's argument. See ll. 1713-8.

Baker missed another opportunity in ll. 1294 f.: "Ich glaub's; nur schade, dasz das Auge modert, Das diese Herrlichkeit erblicken soll." Nollen refers to a passage in l. 990, where *duftend* is used by the Prince to describe his dead body, and comments on Kleist's tendency to use terms that were elsewhere taboo because of their ugly suggestion. It is much more to the point to note that this is one of the finest examples of the result of the poet's struggle with Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*.

The Introduction and Notes as a whole represent at best a lost opportunity and inexcusable borrowing. One wonders how such a piece of work could have passed the scrutinizing care of the general editor.

Excellence of printing and binding can not

atone for such unfortunate editorial shortcomings. Those who wish the better of the two editions will continue to use Nollen's in spite of defects due to its age, unless a brief vocabulary outweigh all scholarly helps.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

University of Michigan.

CORRESPONDENCE

BELLS RINGING WITHOUT HANDS

In *Notes on Chaucer*, Dr. J. S. P. Tatlock refers to the conceit of *bells ringing without hands*, examples of which he cites from ballads, Old French romances, and other sources.¹ With the origin of this conceit and its diffusion in literary and popular tradition, the following remarks will deal.

The use of church bells, first mentioned by Gregory of Tours,² became established during the eighth and ninth centuries. Willibald, writing between 755 and 768, records for the first time a legend of a bell that rang of itself; on this occasion warning the monks of Fulda to return the relics of St. Boniface to Mainz:

"Mirabile statim ac memorabile . . . auditum est miraculum, aecclēsiaeque gloccum in signum ammonitionis sancti corporis, humana non contingente manu commotum est."³

As Willibald's work was widely read and imitated, this legend was freely copied by later writers.⁴ In witness whereof, certain texts may be put in evidence.

1. Nun of Heidenheim (c. 778), *Vita S. Wynnebaldis*: "Confestim . . . illa glocka in aecclēsia sine manibus hominum, sine omnium adminiculo se ipsam commovere cepit."⁵

¹ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIX, April, 1914, p. 98.

² *De Virtutibus S. Martini*, III, 23: Interea signum movetur horis matutinis, adgregatur ut populus. Cf. III, 38.

³ *Vita S. Bonifatii*, 8, ed. W. Levison, p. 53.

⁴ W. Levison, *Vitae Sancti Bonifatii*, p. xvii.

⁵ G. H. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, XV, 115.

2. Monk of Hornbach (c. 826), *Vita S. Pirminii*: "Dum . . . sanctum corpus gleba levaverunt . . . tintinnabulum . . . angelicis, ut credendum est, manibus pulsatum, . . . iucundum reddidit sonum."⁶

3. Altfred of Münster (d. 849), *Vita S. Ludgeri*: "Sed et cloccarum illic sonitus frequenter audiebatur, humana non tangente manu, sed agente potius cognitione deitatis arcana."⁷

4. Flodoard of Rheims (948), *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, IV, 41: "Cui dum propinquare coepissent eis adhuc . . . spatio leugae fere distantibus, ecclesia signa nullo impellente resonare coepere."⁸

As bells were rung to welcome distinguished persons,⁹ so, according to Heiric of Auxerre (d. 876), the bells of a church in Orleans rang of themselves in honor of St. Germain.¹⁰ In a hagiograph written about 900, the bells of Groix are made to greet St. Gwenael of Landevenec, Wales.¹¹

It is evident, then, that by the middle of the tenth century, a literary tradition of bells ringing without hands on certain joyous or solemn occasions, was known to the clerics of Mainz, Heidenheim, Hornbach, Münster, Rheims, Auxerre, and elsewhere. During the eleventh century, the legend passed from the hagiography to the *chansons de geste*, of which "the church had been the cradle."¹² It is thus

found, as Dr. Tatlock observes,¹³ in *Amis et Amiles*, *Li Coroonemanz Loois*,¹⁴ and *Florence de Rome*;¹⁵ also in the romance of *Clariss et Laris*. Bédier has shown, moreover, that *Amis et Amiles* reverted in the twelfth century to ecclesiastical tradition:¹⁶ the hagiograph of *Amicus and Amelius* retains the miracle as in the original text. In time, the legend became a mere literary commonplace of the hagiography.¹⁷

In popular tradition, the belief that church bells at times ring of themselves, is widely prevalent, as shown by the testimony of ballad and tale. Records of it exist in English, Icelandic, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Breton, Welsh, Moravian, and Wendish.¹⁸

PHILLIPS BARRY.

Cambridge, Mass.

COMFORT'S TRANSLATIONS OF CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES

Among the recent publications in *Everyman's Library* is a volume by Professor W. W. Comfort containing translations of four of the romances of Chrétien de Troyes. The translations themselves are excellent, closely following

⁶ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIX, April, 1914, p. 98.

⁷ Only in the text of manuscript D. (E. Langlois, *Li Coroonemanz Loois*, p. 128).

⁸ This romance has been connected with the legends of St. Elisabeth of Hungary. (L. Karl, *Florence de Rome, et la vie de deux Saints de Hongrie*, *Revue des Langues Romanes*, LII, 1909, pp. 163-80.)

⁹ J. Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques*, II, 189, ff.: "L'hagiographe d'Ami et Amile avait sur sa table la *Vita Hadriani*, . . . les *Annales Regni Francorum*, . . . une rédaction de la chanson française d'Ami et Amile; il a mêlé le tout, pour conférer quelque dignité historique à la légende de ses saints."

¹⁰ E. Kölbing, *Amis et Amiloun*, p. cvi: "Dum vero ad sanctam ecclesiam currebant, ut et ibi Deo gratias redderent, mox tintinnabula Deo volente per se sonare ceperunt."

¹¹ F. J. Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 173, 231; III, 235, 244, 519. P. Sébillot, *Le Folk-Lore de France*, II, 454; IV, 142, 143, 174, 342, 380. J. C. Davies, *Folk-Lore of Wales and Mid-Wales*, pp. 209-10 (of a death foretold by the spontaneous ringing of a church-bell).

⁶ *Acta Sanctorum*, 3 Nov., II, 42. The reference is to a chapel-bell ringing of itself as St. Boniface's funeral train passed by.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 26 March, III, 651.

⁸ G. H. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, XIII, 592, relating to St. Balderich of Rheims.

⁹ Gregorius Turonensis, *Historia Francorum*, VI, 11: "Ingrediuntur dux . . . et episcopus . . . cum signis et laudibus."

¹⁰ *Acta Sanctorum*, 31 July, vii, 257: "Cum . . . Aurelianensi urbi iam proximus immineret, extemple signa basilicae senioris nemine impellente concussa concentu ultroneo . . . adventus eius coeperunt esse praenuntia."

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3 Nov., I, 677: "Cum enim applicaret insulae, campanis ecclesiarum nullo pulsante diu sonantibus, et quasi applaudentibus in introitu sanctorum insulani . . . mirabantur."

¹² J. Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques*, IV, 475-6.

the Old French texts, yet sufficiently free in their rendering to do away with any of the awkwardness usually resulting from translations of so literal a character as these. Besides the texts, the work comprises an introduction containing sufficient material on the life and works of Chrétien to meet the desires of the lay reader or to serve the needs of the student who is concerned only indirectly with Chrétien as a figure in mediaeval literature. The notes—not a few of which are taken, as indicated by the translator himself, from those found in the critical editions of the original texts by Professor W. Foerster—and the bibliography, which is complete enough to supply information even to students who have considerably more than a passing interest in Chrétien, not only meet, but even surpass the requirements for a volume of a popular nature.

Thus, briefly, Professor Comfort's work not only enables the reader of English to secure, at second hand, the material in Chrétien more conveniently than has so far been practicable; but it also gives him some idea of what scholarly research in this field entails. It is unfortunate, however, that the work should not suggest, at first glance, its full scope. The title, both on the cover and on the title-page, is *Erec and Enid, by Chrétien de Troyes*, yet it contains, not only *Erec et Enide*, but *Oligés, Le Chevalier de la Charrette (Lancelot)*, and *Le Chevalier au Lion (Yvain)*. As Professor Comfort points out,¹ these four romances may well be classed together, for they are the only works which are indisputably Chrétien's own, and all of them, with the exception of a small part of the *Lancelot*, were composed entirely by him. Furthermore, these are the only ones of his romances which deal with Arthurian matter. Such a title as *The Arthurian Romances of Chrétien de Troyes* would perhaps gain more attention than will the present one. At any rate, one of this sort would have been a boon to both bibliographer and student.

EDYTHE GRACE KELLY.

Columbia University.

¹ Introduction, p. viii.

TWO LINES OF GRILLPARZER

Bebst vor der Schlange? Schlange!
Die mich umwunden, die mich umstrickt,
Die mich verderbt, die mich getötet!

(*Die Argonauten*, ll. 1541-43.)

The two lines in question are the last two quoted. The second volume of the new Grillparzer edition,² this particular volume being edited by Reinhold Backmann, gives a comment on these lines, which, as well as several others there adduced and refuted, fails to find the real meaning of Grillparzer's words. The lines are perhaps not immediately plain when one first reads them, yet they are very important, since they express the emotional effect on Medea's mind of her own tragedy. They sum up as much of that tragedy as already lies in the past and they anticipate whatever there is left of it for the future.

The comment referred to is as follows:

V. 1541. Falsch ist es, wenn Pachaly auf Gesslers Hass im "Tell" verweist und meint, wie dieser vergesse es Jason Medea nie, dass sie ihn schwach gesehen, und das falle mehr ins Gewicht als der Schimpf und Spott, den Medea über den "Starken, Kühnen, Gewaltigen" ausgiesst. Davon kann bei Grillparzer keine Rede sein. Auch ein Ausbruch der Reue bei Medea, der Reue, ihm gefolgt zu sein (Verres) kann es doch nicht genannt werden. Gleich gar nicht aber hat Matthias recht, wenn er sagt: "Sie fühlt sich unwunden, umstrickt, verderbt und getötet von der Schlange des Geschickes, das ihrer wartet" und ihre Worte "Prophetische Worte" nennt, "die auf die Zukunft gehen." Was es aber ist? Eine Aufreizung Jasons? wohl nicht. Sie will die Wirkung des Schrecklichen bei Jason verdoppeln, ihn abhalten, zu gehen, es ist ihr letzter Versuch.

These interpretations do not seem to fit. The right one is both simple and evident. Throughout the *Gastfreund* and the *Argonauten* up to this point, Grillparzer has laid great stress on Medea's freedom. She is introduced to us as a huntress, a sort of Amazon, who despises one of her girls for being captured by the love of

² Grillparzers Werke, Im Auftrage der Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien, herausgegeben von August Sauer. 2. Bd. Wien und Leipzig, 1913.

a man. She continually emphasizes her independence of will. Now she herself has fallen a prey to the very servitude she so strongly condemned in Peritta. As if by a hypnotic spell Jason enslaves her will, prevents her from aiding her people, even makes her turn traitor and discover the way to the Fleece. Her defeat is as complete as his victory is ruthless and brutal. Immediately after this struggle between them, occurs the scene from which the lines in question are taken. Jason and Medea, against her bitter protests, are already in the cave where the dragon guards the coveted trophy. Once again, just before Jason opens the fatal doors behind which the danger lies, Medea implores him by her love to desist. Her inner resistance he brushes aside as easily as her outward resistance—no deeper humiliation could be imposed on Medea. The doors spring open, and the sight Jason sees is so terrifying that he shrieks aloud and rushes to the foreground. It is then that Medea, wildly laughing, begins her mad speech, overwhelming him with mockery and accusing him of being brave only when he has to deal with her. She asks him why he shrinks from the "Schlange," and in the next breath she calls him a "Schlange" (l. 1541). In the comment to l. 1506 the editor refers this word, "Schlange," to Jason, and it is therefore all the stranger that he should not refer the "Die mich umwunden, etc." to him as well, rather than, as he apparently does, to the real serpent. Medea tells Jason to go and be enfolded, entwined and destroyed by this dragon, as she has been enfolded, entwined and destroyed by his love. This idea also easily explains a subsequent line (1550), to which the comment is not very clear. Medea says:

Geh hin, mein süßer Bräutigam,
Wie züngelt deine Braut!

What does she mean by "süßer Bräutigam," and by calling the serpent Jason's "Braut"? She puts a world of irony and scorn into the first of these expressions. Her "gentle lover" has just a moment before subjected her to the bitterest humiliation of soul—she has just experienced his conception of the relation of "Bräutigam." What he has just done to her the serpent will now do to him, *i. e.*, become

his bride, or what is the same according to his methods, will enfold and destroy him.

Grillparzer thus shows Medea in a state of despair little removed from madness. And Jason exclaims:

Von mir weg, Weib, in deiner Raserei!
Mein Geist geht unter in des deinen Wogen!

Her mood here is the same as that we see later, only in an intensified form, when her final reckoning with her "gentle lover" occurs in the third part of the trilogy.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph Macon Woman's College.

BEDE'S Death Song

To a list of MSS. preserving versions of Bede's Death-Song, which R. Brotanek has recently printed (*Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Halle, 1913, p. 150 f.), should be added MS. No. LXIX of Stonyhurst College, in which, at fol. 15a, is found a copy of Cuthbert's letter to Cuthwin on the death of Bede, with the Anglo-Saxon verses (written as prose) on fol. 15b. The text of the poem has been printed already in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Mss. II*, p. 144 of the appendix. The following copy is the result of a fresh collation of that text with the Stonyhurst MS. recently made by Dr. Carleton Brown.

For þam ned fere
Næni wyrþeþ
þances snotera
þoñ him þearf sy
To ge hiegegne
Ær nis heonen gange
Hræt his gaste
godes opþe yfeles
Æfter deaþe heonon
Demed þeorþe.

It will be seen that the Stonyhurst text belongs among the more numerous versions preserved in the Southern dialect. Comparison with the texts printed by Brotanek makes it appear that it agrees exactly with the version of the poem in MS. Digby 211.

CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN.

Bryn Mawr College.

BRIEF MENTION

Teachers of French literature are much indebted to Professor Christian Gauss for bringing out a volume of *Selections from the Works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Princeton University Press, 1914). As the editor indicates in his preface, it has always been a matter of great difficulty to find anything of Rousseau's which could be conveniently obtained for class-room use, the result having been that the average student passes him by unread. Professor Gauss, therefore, without attempting an exhaustive presentation, has simply chosen four articles, each complete in itself, which would give the reader some idea of the style and manner of thinking of the author. The items selected are the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, two *Lettres à M. de Malesherbes* dated respectively January 12th and 26th, 1762, and the *Cinquième rêverie du promeneur solitaire*. The text is prefaced by a Biographical Note and a pleasing Introduction, and is followed by the necessary Notes. The booklet as a whole is attractive in appearance, though one might wish for slightly larger typing in the text.

M. P. B.

Prokosch's *Deutsches Lese- und Übungsbuch* (Holt and Company, 1913, 8vo., vi + 117 pp.) is intended as a Reader "to be taken after six or ten weeks of work in elementary German." The reading matter is divided into six parts, the first part dealing with Germany as a whole, each of the others with a division. The prose selections are followed by "Erklärungen," "Fragen," and "Übungen." In the case of poems, the "Fragen" and "Übungen" are omitted. All of this apparatus is, in the main, in German that is idiomatic, and simple enough to be within the comprehension of the beginner. The book, furthermore, offers the advantage of combining features of the older type of Reader with much of the newer *Realien*. A considerable amount of verse is included. It is, on the whole, well chosen, but unfortunately there is scarcely a single selection that is correctly given. In some cases the variation is doubtless intentional, as when, with sovereign freedom, Uhland's *Des Knaben Berglied* is reduced from five to three stanzas, or when, in the *Lied des Hirten* from *Tell*, the refrain is omitted, while in the *Lied des Alpenjägers* the last two lines are run into one, an operation that, incredible as it may seem, is also ventured upon in the first lines of the *Wandrer's Nachtlied*. If such mutilations are necessary, considerations of *Pietät* demand that they be at least noted.

Other cases seem real corruptions of the text, so, to mention only a part, *erwacht* for *erwachet*, p. 56, l. 1; *spielen* for *spülen* (*die Wasser*), p. 56, l. 2; *Lief er gleich* (*schnell*), p. 35, l. 4; *ohne* for *ohn'*, p. 17, l. 7 (a *three*, not a *four* beat line); *hält* for *hat*, p. 68, l. 3.—A curious misconception is found in the note on *Kron' und Schweif* from the *Erbkönig*: "Nach manchen Sagen hat der König der Woldgeister die Gestalt einer riesenhaften Katze mit einer goldenen Krone auf dem Haupte." In keeping with this interpretation the Vocabulary renders *Schweif* with *tail*. Are we to conclude, accordingly, that *Erbkönigs Töchter* are "giant kittens"? That the map accompanying the volume is inadequate is shown by the fact that several names in the text (*Havel*, p. 5, l. 15; *Thüringer Wald*, *Fichtelgebirge*, *Naab*, p. 62) are not to be found on it. Osnabrück (p. 23, l. 45) is not in Westfalen but in Hanover. The number 5000, p. 78, l. 17, should, I suppose, be 65,000 (Gebhardt II, 185). With proper corrections, the *Lese- und Übungsbuch* should prove a very serviceable First Year Reader.

Meyer-Lübke's *Introducción al estudio de la Lingüística Romance*; traducción, revisada por el autor,¹ de la segunda edición alemana, por Américo Castro (Madrid, Revista de Archivos, 1914, 8vo., 365 pp.) is intended primarily for use by "las gentes de lengua española." In view, however, of the many improvements introduced into the Spanish version, the book deserves a more general use than that just noted. The initial chapter (Bibliografía) is brought up to date, and a consecutive reading of the remaining chapters is much simplified by the plan of printing as foot-notes all adjustable bibliography. The translator's additions consist of elucidations of obscure points in the German text and further illustrative material for various linguistic phenomena, in which tasks he has been aided by Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos. All additional material is clearly designated by means of square brackets. It is to be regretted that the word-index does not offer a complete record of the additional material. To cite but a few of the many omissions: Spanish *atril* 184, *efeuto* 109, *latril* 184, *nimbla* 176, *Los Arejos* 184, *Alcátara* 299, *Bisagra* 299; French *cheveu* 52, *grotte* 54, *moulin* 76; etc. The volume appears under the auspices of the "Junta para ampliación de estudios é investigaciones científicas."

¹ P. 251 note: "Desde aquí hasta el final va el texto sin la revisión del autor por hallarse interrumpidas las comunicaciones postales con Austria.—Agosto de 1914."